

PAKISTHAN EXAMINED

WITH
THE PARTITION SCHEMES OF
DR. LATIF, SIR SIKANDAR HYAT KHAN
AND OTHERS

BY
REZAUL KARIM, M. A., B. L.
AUTHOR OF *For India and Islam, Muslims*
and the Congress, Anecdotes of
Hazrat Mohammad, etc.

Foreword by
MAULVI SYED NAUSHER ALI, B. L.
Ex-Minister, Bengal

THE BOOK COMPANY LTD.
43B, COLLEGE SQUARE, CALCUTTA

[All rights reserved]

FOREWORD

BY

SYED NAUSHER ALI,

Ex-Minister, Bengal.

Moulvi Rezaul Karim requires no introduction. I do not know of a second Bengali Muslim who has contributed in writing more than Moulvi Rezaul Karim to the cause of Indian Nationalism. I have not had the good fortune of making his acquaintance or cultivating his friendship ; but I have known him through his writings as an ardent patriot and a sound thinker who has never missed any opportunity of criticising and exposing the hollowness of communal cries. His writings have always reflected his sound thinking and courage of conviction and I have derived much benefit from them. The present articles on Pakistan, I am sure, will dispel many an illusion and will be a pointer to Muslim India as to which way the salvation lies. The Pakistan scheme is a mirage, which will soon vanish in the air and with it will be buried the ugly demon of communalism and India will emerge out as one solid nation freed from the chain of bondage, standing shoulder to shoulder with the comity of nations of the world and contributing to the peace, prosperity and happiness of mankind. I have no doubt the study of Moulvi Rezaul Karim's writings specially the present articles will contribute a good deal to the attainment of this end. The book deserves wide circulation.

PREFACE

Much has been said about the probability and improbability of the Pakistan Scheme. The supporters of the Scheme do not like to enter deeply into the matter. They do not want to foresee the disastrous consequences that the Scheme is likely to produce on the country as a whole and particularly on the Muslims themselves. An impartial critic will find that the entire Scheme was conceived in a spirit of revenge. A defeatist mentality pervades in and through the Scheme. The recent history of Palestine will be an eye-opener to all the Muslims of India. In many respects the problem of Palestine is very like the problem of India. The differences in Palestine were between the Arabs and the Jews, and in India, the differences are between the Hindus and the Muslims. The remedy suggested by Britain to solve the Palestine problem is to divide the country between the Jews and the Arabs. The Peel Commission appointed by British Government suggested a partition scheme under which there would be a mandated territory,—a Jewish state and an Arab state. The brave Arabs—Moslems and Christians—rejected the Scheme. But here in India some of our Muslim brothers are bent upon partitioning India into Muslim India and Hindu India. The Scheme that was rejected by the Arabs has found a shelter in the minds of some of the Muslims of India. None but the British Imperialism will be benefited by the partition scheme. In these essays I have tried to show that the entire Pakistan Scheme is a mirage in the name of Muslim interests ; it will perpetuate the slavery of India. The readers will find in them an impartial study of the Scheme. I firmly

believe that India is one and indivisible and all the people of India with all their differences comprise one Nation. If these writings inspire a single Muslim with the idea of nationalism, I shall be amply repaid in my labour.

REZAUL KARIM.

Calcutta.

12.10.41.

*Dedicated to the
Sacred Memory of*
ABDUR RASUL

and His Band of Ardent Co-workers
like Master Didar Bakhsh, Maulvis
Leakat Hosain, Mujibar Rahman,
Abul Kasem, Abul Hosain

who

Together with Their Innumerable
Hindu Compatriots valiantly fought
against the First Partition of India
by the British Government and
became successful in Annulling the
Partition of Bengal

REZAUL KARIM

CONTENTS

HINDU INDIA AND MUSLIM INDIA	...
CULTURAL ZONES IN INDIA	...
PARTITION OF INDIA	...
FACTORS OF NATIONALISM	...
SCHEMES FOR THE PARTITION OF INDIA	...
MOTIVE BEHIND THE PARTITION SCHEME	...
POLITICAL ASPECT OF PAKISTAN	...
ECONOMIC ASPECT OF PAKISTAN	...
PAKISTAN AND THE MASSES	...
FROM THE MUSLIM LEAGUE FRONT	...
BURY THE PAKISTAN PLAN	...
MUSLIMS IN UNITED INDIA	...
IMMEDIATE MOTIVE OF PAKISTAN	...
INDIA IS OUR HOME	...
UNITED INDIA	...
POSITION OF THE MUSLIMS IN INDIA	...
POSITION OF HINDU-MUSLIM CULTURE	...
THE REAL PROBLEM FOR THE MUSLIM MASSES	...
MUSLIM SOLIDARITY	...
ISLAM AND POLITICS	...
INDIAN MUSLIMS MISLED	...
MINORITIES UNDER DEMOCRACY	...
IRAQ—A LESSON FOR INDIAN MUSLIMS	...
SIR SYED AHMAD'S CONCEPTION OF NATIONHOOD	...
HAIL, MOTHER INDIA	...
APPENDIX	
DR. LATIF'S SCHEME	...
SIR SIKANDAR HAYAT KHAN'S SCHEME	...
VIEWS OF OTHERS ON PAKISTAN	...

PAKISTHAN EXAMINED

HINDU INDIA & MUSLIM INDIA

At a time when the whole of India is making strenuous attempts to build a sort of strong national solidarity out of a mass of opposing and heterogeneous elements it is a great pity that a section of her people is bent upon creating a division in that solid national phalanx. For the last fifty years it has been the dream of every sincere patriot of the country to see the birth of one united and undivided India, where the Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Sikhs, Christians and other religious fraternities should live together like brothers of the same family and ultimately be moulded into one solid and compact nation. And for this sacred cause, our valiant soldiers had fought many battles, sacrificed many lives and undergone many trials and tribulations. But from the very outset it has been dominant policy of our alien rulers to break that solidarity, to divide India into numerous artificial groups, sections and sub-sections. The various communal organisations that we find in the country to-day, are the direct outcome of that policy. So long the leaders of the communal organisations had been busy in quarrelling over the questions of seats and services and other trifling things which had nothing to do with the freedom of the country. The idea of one Indian nation was not as yet challenged. But with the inauguration of the new Reform with the Communal Award as its integral part the policy of the communal leaders has undergone a thorough change.

As they have nothing to say about seats and services, they have changed their front ; they have begun to challenge the very ideal for which patriotic Indians have been fighting for the last fifty years. Instead of one Indian nation, a new claim has now been made by the sponsors of communalism that India should be divided into two parts, one a Hindu India and the other a Muslim India. One Indian nation is an anathema with them, they will have two Indian nations.

The early supporters of communalism did never imagine that apart from the question of safeguards and reservations for the Muslims, communalism could have any other implication and significance. They did not conceive that communalism would so degenerate as it would make the hopes of one Indian nation an idle dream. They believed that because the Muslims were backward in education, certain special favours were necessary for them for a definite period of time. Due to the short-sighted policy of these communal leaders, communalism has transgressed its limits ; it is now out of control of those who considered it to be a temporary settlement. It has now entered upon a new phase of its life.

They want to divide India into two broad divisions—Hindu India and the Muslim India. The Muslim India will comprise all the provinces that lie to the west of the river Jamuna. "The Pakistan is a political term that has been recently coined to define the movement for the Union of the provinces of Sind, Beluchistan, North-West Frontier Provinces and the Punjab and Kashmir. Between them, these areas have a Muslim population with a proportion of about four-fifths, and it is no exaggeration to say that the people of these provinces, Muslim in religion, culture and tradition, have much more in common with each other than with the Hindu India. The bond of Indian nationhood is

founded on geographical and administrative conditions, the latter purely artificial and arbitrary ; whereas the bond between the peoples of Pakistan is ethnic and organic"—(*The Eastern Times, Lahore*—24th July, 1935).

That is, all those portions of India where Hindus predominate will belong to India proper, and all those provinces where the Muslims form the majority will be called Pakistan. The Pakistanists are of opinion that the people of Pakistan differ from that of India in culture, religion, civilization, language and literature and there is nothing in common with the people of India. If Pakistan is separated from India, the most conflicting problem of the Hindu and the Muslim will be solved for ever. The founder of the movement is Mr. Rahmat Ali of the Punjab of which he is the president. He chalked out plan to divide India into two parts as noted above. Later on other men have joined him and movement has become favourite with those who were dreaming of founding a Muslim kingdom over India. Strange to say that all those persons who have always supported British imperialism in India, have become now the advocates of the Pakistan movement. But those Muslims who always supported the freedom movement of the country are almost to a man stoutly against this movement, even though they are the inhabitants of the Pakistan. The Muslim Leaguers, the reactionaries now found in this movement a fresh impetus to spread communalism in the country. When we consider the Pakistan movement in its true perspective, this point should not be ignored.

Recently the Karachi session of the Muslim League has passed a resolution supporting the idea of Pakistan movement and the creation of an Islamic State on the western frontiers of India. The argument they advance in favour of the Pakistan movement is quite in consonance with the comm

ideals of the Muslim League. The Hindus in India are the majority community and so they maltreat the Muslims. The creation of an Islamic State will protect the Muslims from the persecution of the Hindus as it would serve as an asylum for the persecuted Muslims. They further argue that an independent Islamic State is the cherished dream of the Muslims throughout India. The separation of Pakistan from India will fulfil their dream. The Sudeten problem is the same as the problem of Pakistan ; and so, if Germany be allowed to disconnect the Sudeten area from Czechoslovakia, the Pakistani should be allowed to have a separate State of their own. The natural boundary of India is up to the River Jamuna ; beyond that there is a tract of land which is not India, it is a different country and should be the home of a separate State.

Let us now examine whether these arguments are tenable in the light of facts. The proposition that the natural boundary of India is up to the river Jamuna is wrong and erroneous. Without the Punjab and the N. W. F. Provinces the geography of India is incomplete and inconceivable. It may be shown from the ancient history of India, that from time immemorial those two portions were the integral parts of India and the last limits of the Frontier Province were the natural boundaries of India. During the palmy days of the Aryan civilization, Kandahar and Afghanistan were included in the Indian continent. The principality that was invaded and conquered by Alexander the Great was within India and that portion was the Punjab. The Pathans and the Mughals also included the Frontier Provinces within their empires. If any portions were conquered by the Afghans and other tribes, the Mughal emperors did not rest content until these were re-annexed to their kingdom. Those provinces were governed by deputies appointed by the central authority at Delhi. During the troublous times

of early British rule, Ranjit Singh was the ruler of the Punjab and the neighbouring countries, and when his power was overthrown, the whole of that portion was again annexed to India. For the last hundred years these portions have been included in the vast continent of India under one rule and Government. The popular sentiment is that the Pakistan portions of the earth is within India and form one compact and undivided India.

With regard to the question of language, culture, creed etc. we must say that it is wrong to separate a province from the mother country on that account. In India there are at present eleven provinces and the language, culture etc. of one province differs from that of the other. There are several languages and dialects in many provinces. There is conflict of culture, race, religion and language in each province. If for this account the western portions of India be separated and are formed into a distinct State then, in the near future other province may claim the same privilege and thus India will be divided into numerous States, having no unity and cohesion among themselves. Thus the idea of Indian solidarity will never be realised. Therefore, the conflict of culture, language etc. is no valid ground for the creation of separate and independent State from any portion of India.

We admit that the frontier people are virile and stardy, martial and vigorous, but that is no reason for the creation of a separate State. Rather if these people are united with India they will supply brave soldiers for the defence of the country from foreign invasion. The arms of the frontier Pathans together with the brain of the Indians will make India more invincible than Japan and Russia, Italy and Germany. It is for the benefit of the Pakistanists themselves that their portion should be wedded to India, the mother-country. However strong the Pathans may be.

they are separated from the rest of India they alone will not be able to hold their own ground against the aggression of a first class power. Hostile India on one side and Japan or Afghan or Russia on the other, the separated Pakistan is no match for any foreign invasion. India will be more friendly to Pakistan than other power on earth. We ask which is more preferable—Pakistan becoming a subject province of an Asiatic power or a province of India on perfect equality and right? We believe that the second alternative is more preferable.

We believe that no sober Muslim of India will like the idea of creating a separate and independent State out of India which is a compact and undivided country. If the Muslims of Pakistan form themselves into a separate nation for their safety against the aggrandizement of the Hindus, then what would be the conditions of the Muslims who would be compelled to live in India?—where will these Muslims go to seek their safety? Will Pakistan be able to protect them from the “oppression” of “The Hindu India”? Ultimately they will have to fall back either on the Hindus or on an alien power. Hence the ultimate result of the creation of Pakistan will be the increase of the British hold over India.

What a non-Indian Muslim lady Halide Edib, the eminent and well-known Turkish lady of international fame says in this connection is worthy of note. “As for the extreme Muslim communalist”, says she “he is even a greater stumbling block in India’s struggle for independence than the extreme Hindu communalist. He (the Muslim) is no good for his own community, for he has no constructive plan for its uplift. As to his attitude towards the Hindus, he deludes himself that by the mere fact of calling himself a Muslim (without any understanding of its broad and enduring principles) and by the capacity he has both for

dying and killing more readily than the Hindus, he will easily dominate the Hindus in the future. Though he sincerely believes that Muslim India is a separate nation, he has never thought out whether it is possible or not, to have two nations living in the same country in a modern state. Hence the moment it comes to a communal settlement on communal lines, there seems two alternatives ; either to admit that a third power must be there to keep the peace or consider that India is face to face with an everlasting impasse. . . . Will India then be led by the communalists who believe in two Indian nations? Considering the progress achieved in India the inability of a communalist organisation to cope with the requiremets of a modern State, the writer is disposed to think it not possible for any length of time"— ("Inside India"—page 348—362).

CULTURAL ZONES IN INDIA

Among the luminaries of the Muslim "intelligentsia" who have shed lustre on the political problem of India, the name of Dr. Syed Abdul Latif is a new one ; but though new, he is not less important than any others of the same galaxy. He has at once leaped into prominence by his adventurous scheme of the partition of India. For the last fifty years, they have been dinning into our ears that the most vital problem of India is the communal problem. Various measures were suggested by our leaders for the solution of that vital problem, but all of them proved abortive. Now has come the turn of Dr. Latif who has made a new departure by placing before us a new solution. The problems of services, electorate, cow-killing or music before mosque do not constitute, according to him, the vital problem. It is the problem of cultural differences that lie

at the root of all our troubles. Whatever solution one may suggest, as long as there are Hindus and Muslims in India, so long no solution can settle the communal problem. Therefore, according to Dr. Latif, the better course is to separate the Hindus and the Muslims and the other minorities in such a way that none will have the chance of seeing even the face of each other. This will solve the communal problem of India for ever. Thus he wants to cut the Gordian knot at one stroke of his pen. Even Alexander the Great would not have dared to do it so ably as Dr. Latif has done. This separation will be possible only if India is partitioned into several groups, such as Hindu India, Muslim India, Sikh India, Christian India etc. etc. Each portion will be allotted to the members of one community only. There will be four cultural zones for the Muslims and eleven zones for the Hindus. In the Muslim zones the Muslims will predominate and in the Hindu zones the Hindus will predominate. Thus the dread of the Muslims about Hindu domination over them will be gone for ever.

But there are other communities besides the Hindus and the Muslims. In this way India will be divided into numerous zones where different communities will live as free peoples having not the slightest chance of quarrelling with the others. Dr. Latif is a practical man and he has given a practical suggestion for the solution of India's problem. The dream of a united and homogeneous India is the dream of lunatics, and those self-forgetful patriots who have shed their life-blood for the cause of the unification of India are mere idle day-dreamers. And the man of practical politics and high common sense is Dr. Latif.

The ground upon which Dr. Latif has drawn his favourite scheme is too well-known to need any mention. That there are different religions, different cultures in India, that the people always quarrel with each other, that there exists

permanent enmity between the different people, that one is distrustful of the other, that the vital problem of India is not political or economic, it is cultural, that there will always exist conflict of culture—these and sundry other difficulties and obstacles stand in the way of the unification of India. As there are different cultures, there cannot evolve a single nationality in India. So it is safe, so says Dr. Latif, to divide India on cultural lines. Though the Muslim League lays too much stress on the cultural differences of the people of India, yet to an unsophisticated onlooker who knows how to view things in their true perspective, it would seem that India's vital problem is not cultural but political and economic. By the gradual processes of adaptation, amalgamation, and assimilation the people of India have been evolving a common culture which will be handed over to the posterity as the common heritage of India. Things that are agitating the mind and are breaking the backbone of the people are their political and economic serfdom. Misery and common catastrophe have made them think in terms of one common ideal. Therefore, if the political and economic problem is the top problem of India, then there is no hindrance to the way of India's being evolved into a single, united and undivided nation. When there is unity in the vital-points and there exists a common ground of agreement between a large section of the people, why should one rake up the minor points of disagreement and discord?

The word "culture" is vague, ambiguous, and full of numerous interpretations. The word is generally used by the Muslim leaders through ignorance, but very often to exploit the ignorance of the masses. The Muslim League always love to confound it with religion. But Islamic religion is not the same thing with Islamic culture. It is very difficult to find the truly Islamic culture even in the

way of living of the most stalwart adherents of the Muslim leaders. Many Muslims adopt a culture which is neither Islamic nor Hindu. So also the Hindus. Men brought up in the western ideals adopt a culture which is different from the orthodox ideals of the Pundits, Mollas and Moulanas. That is to say all the Muslims do not adopt the same culture as they adopt the same religion. Though religion does not admit of change, culture admits of change. The culture of to-morrow may be different from that of to-day and a hundred years hence there may be a new type of culture. Culture grows from day to day ; it assimilates, adapts and amalgamates all the surrounding conditions of the age. If other factors of common well-being do not exist, you may divide the people of a country into religious groups, but to divide people on cultural lines is unthinkable. It will be only what is called cross division. The native Jews, Christians and Muslims of Arabia do not follow the same religion, but they possess or inherit the same culture. If we view things impartially, we shall find that a common culture both for the Hindus and the Muslims is already on the way of evolution. The Pathan culture and the Moghul culture is not the object of pride of the Muslims alone ; even the Hindus take pride in them as they are the backbone of Indian culture. Thus we find that the undue stress that Dr. Latif puts on the cultural differences of India has no solid foundation. It is only to exploit the ignorance of the Muslim masses that the Muslim leaders have touched at the wrong points. They have minimised over points of agreement and by shedding crocodile tears they have raked up the points of differences which are neither vital nor insoluble.

We admit that over certain minor matters the Hindus and the Muslims of India quarrel with each other ; we also admit that there are certain differences between the

CULTURAL ZONES IN INDIA

Hindu outlook and the Muslim outlook. We ask the Muslim leaders, is it patriotism and statesmanship always to harp on the points of difference and always to remind the people of those points wherein they differ? We believe that patriotism, good sense and true love of the country demand that we should minimise the points of difference and put greater stress on the points of agreement. If we meet together, assemble together, confer together, we will be able to tie each other by the bonds of unity, brotherhood and fellow citizenship; our difference will then merge into one and we will think more of unity than of discord and disharmony. In India, there has grown up a band of faithful patriots who have for the last fifty years been always reminding the people of the unity of our interests and ideals in political and economic matters. It is through their efforts that a sort of common consciousness has grown up in the mind of the people that India must be liberated from the shackles of foreign domination. The alien government knew wherein lay our weakness. If any section of our people take up that point and exploit the ignorance of the masses by reminding them of those minor points wherein they differed, we have no other alternative than to call them the secret agents of British Imperialism.

We have gone through the learned discourse of Dr. Latif on the cultural future of India and we are tempted to say that he has borrowed verbatim all those catch pleas that the British Government put forward to delay the grant of further reforms to the people of India. Prior to the Simon Commission various Commissions were held by the British Government to discuss India's political problem and they pronounced in one voice that in India the points of differences are more fundamental than the points of agreement. The Simon Commission repeated the same pleas of India's backwardness and disunity. . But excepting

a few persons who are beholden to the Government, the bulk of the Indians protested against the statement of the Simon Commission that the Indians cannot be moulded into a nation. The difficulties and drawbacks that Dr. Latif has put forward are neither vital nor fundamental. No nation on earth can think of partitioning a country on those grounds. We believe that there are other motives behind the schemes of Dr. Latif. Otherwise, he would never have dared to think of partitioning India on such flimsy pretexts of cultural differences. The activities of Herr Hitler are an instance in point. The idea of unifying all the German people under one banner is only a plea to further the imperialistic designs of new Germany. The motive that is working behind Dr. Latif's scheme is too obvious to need any mention. Dr. Latif's scheme gives an additional stimulus to that end. The so-called cultural differences that are agitating the mind of Dr. Latif are not so vital as to justify the partition of India according to the scheme laid down by the learned Doctor. If India is partitioned in the way suggested by him, then the prospects of freedom of the country will be destroyed for ever.

PARTITION OF INDIA

In a country where economic and political aspirations of the people are one and same, it is dangerous, nay suicidal, to introduce religious elements in its everyday affair. Religion is more or less a personal matter and politics is a social matter. A person living in a single or in an isolated tract of land may be a perfectly religious man. But such a person can have no politics. Politics begins where isolation of man ends. There cannot be two kinds of politics for the same people in the same portion of land. In an

advanced society a state within the state is an anomaly. If the sovereignty of the state is destroyed, there can be no security and peace in the land. In the name of religion the Jews of England, France or America cannot claim differential treatment from the State. The fundamental rights and the rights of citizenship are the only thing that are necessary for them. The State is for all whether the people are Christians or non-Christians. If preferential treatment is given to a portion of the people on the ground of religion, then the integrity, indivisibility and security of the state as well as of the nation will be destroyed for ever. In the eye of the State all of its citizens must have equal rights and equal opportunities. We always expected that the Indians who want to emancipate their country from foreign bondage would be guided by these ideals and would not allow others to divide the country according to their whims or caprices. If the people had accepted this principle, our struggle for freedom would have been more persistent and vigorous. But difficulties came in the way and destroyed our national solidarity in the name of religion. Religious questions ought to have been confined within certain limits, as is done in the free countries of the world. When a private matter is allowed to be intermingled in a public affair the whole thing becomes a confused heap of ruin and devastation. In our country religious question has come to such a pass that a few of our fellow-citizens have begun to think of partitioning India into numerous portions on religious basis. Did they ever think what would be the condition of India if she is partitioned on the basis of religion and culture? A partitioned India can never regain her freedom ; she will always remain in bondage ; and if by any chance accidents she gets her freedom, she would instantly succumb to the invading hordes of the foreigners as was done in the past on numerous occasions.

The most ardent advocate of such a scheme is the Muslim League and its stalwart leaders. They cannot think of residing in a country where members of different communities would thrive side by side, would follow their religion and culture and get remain as an integral part of the nation. No country under the Muslim rule was ever divided on Communal line, no portion of the land was allotted to the people of a particular religious persuasion on the plea that if they had lived together, they would quarrel with one another. The conception of state in the modern sense was not developed then, and the land was considered as a matter of personal profits of the ruler and yet they did not adopt the method suggested by Dr. Latif. If they had done this, they would certainly have detected some obvious difficulties that are inherent in that scheme of partition of land on religious and cultural lines.

First, then the administration of the country would have been impossible. Constant rebellion, depredation and warfare would have destroyed the security of the land. Secondly, there would have never been any fusion of culture. Muslim civilization would have remained in its crude stage. Muslims and non-Muslims were allowed to live together, mix together and interchange their ideas among each other and the result was that there grew up a civilization and culture which far outshone the existing ones. But if on the other hand the land was separated on Communal lines and the non-Muslims were made to know that they were a separate people, they would have made common cause with others who were inimical to the ruling chief and they would have destroyed the integrity of the state. In many cases the rulers deviated from the broad principles with the result that there came a crash which collapsed the entire fabric of the kingdom. Under the Pathan and Moghal regime, Hindus and Muslims of India lived together side by side. Sometimes they

quarrelled, sometimes they remained in peace. Sometimes the rulers were oppressive and in some cases they were benevolent. Against the oppressive ruler the Hindus and the Muslims made common cause and overthrew him, and placed a different man on the throne. But the rulers never conceived the idea of separating the Hindus and the Muslims from each other and placing them in separate lands. It is for this reason that we find many villages contain both Hindus and Muslims. Upto the time of the East India Company such was the condition of India. During the stormy days of the 17th and 18th century when the central power was shaken to the bottom, there grew up several independent petty states, some of which were ruled by Hindu princes and some by Muslim princes. Just as there were many Muslim subjects in Hindu states, so also there were many Hindu subjects in Muslim states. And the subjects stood faithfully and loyally by their rulers and fought against the rulers of their co-religionists. But the foolish idea of interchange of people on religious lines was never conceived by any of the rulers. If the principle of dividing people on religious ground was a perfect principle, then that was the right time for the realisation of that ideal. There were numerous states, all free and independent. They could easily have done that. The rulers did not divide the people, but they were not themselves united together. The Hindu states and Muslim states fought with each other, while the European powers were knocking at their very gates. What was the result? By and by all the independent states succumbed to the European powers. Total lack of co-hesion among the ruling chiefs is mainly responsible for our serfdom. And if India is divided on communal lines as suggested by Dr. Latif, there will always be lack of co-operation and co-hesion which will expose us to the powerful foreign enemies.

Let us now review in one sweep the political condition of India, on the eve of the ascendancy of the British Power. There were several strong principalities, states and kingdoms. The Mahratta, the Muslim states of Hyderabad, Mysore, Oudh and Bengal, and the Sikhs of the Punjab—these were strong enough to resist the combined forces of France and England. But all were divided, petty feuds and jealousies prevented them from giving a united front to the foreigners. All of them could perceive that the British Powers were gradually getting a strong foot-hold in the country. But could they unite together to form one solid bloc to prevent this? Each of the Indian states views with each other in seeking British help to crush his rival prince. How the British Power won the battle of Arcot in the Deccan and Plassy in Bengal would serve as an eye-opener to those who are dreaming of partitioning India on religious lines. Hyder Ali and Tippo Sultan were crushed with the Mahratta help and the Mahrattas were crushed with the help of the Muslim and some of the Mahrattas themselves. When one state was ceded to the British Power, the other remained passive spectator till the whole of India was brought under British control. Even during the time of Sepoy Mutiny all the Indian powers could not unite together. Lessons of past history are written on the wall and if we neglect them we shall be digging our grave. That history teaches us one unmistakable lesson that India should not be divided into numerous states.

I should like to ask one question to Dr. Latif, when would the scheme of partition of India be effected? To-day or when we shall attain freedom? With the help of British Government we can of course partition India according to the scheme of Dr. Latif. But in that case I can predict that neither the Muslim India nor the Hindu India will ever attain freedom. Both portion of India will for ever remain

tied to the chariot-wheel of British imperialism. There will not be concentration of energy and no united action will be possible. One part of India will be played off against the other and perpetual serfdom will be our lot. But if India is divided after freedom is achieved, then no state will be able to retain its freedom. The events of the 17th and 18th centuries will be again enacted on the soil of India. Many Muslims expect that if India is partitioned according to the scheme of Dr. Latif, then the adjoining Muslim independent states will unite with us and thus we shall be a strong nation. But that expectation is chimerical. The moment when Afghanistan will be tacked to India, or a portion of India, her independence will be jeopardised. Afghanistan or other Muslim powers will make a slave of the Muslims of the Punjab or the Frontier. Pan-Islamism is no rule of life there. There the Afghans or the Persians are first and foremost Afghans or Persians. Some Timur or Nadir Khan will carry death and devastation into our land and leave us as slave as we are to-day. The next question to be considered is that all the Muslim powers are trembling before the mighty powers of Europe and Japan. It is foolish to expect that they would dare to touch the dust of land upon which are fixed the vigilant eyes of the big powers of the world. When the Muslim powers are every moment awaiting the fate of Albania and Abyssinia, is it possible to expect that they would accept the invitation of Dr. Latif and Mr. Jinnah to shoulder the responsibility of India and thus precipitate their own ruin?

FACTORS OF NATIONALISM

In my previous article on "Cultural Zones in India", I tried to show that the problem of cultural differences is not a vital problem in India. Those who like to lay too much stress on the cultural problem are guilty of wilfully overlooking all those unifying elements that are by themselves sufficient to bind all the people of India under one political ideal. "To talk of a single nationality", says Dr. Latif "for the whole of India, therefore, in the absence of all material factors indispensable to its existence, is a bold venture, and can be justified only when it is pointed out that at least some kind of common moral consciousness that I have spoken of is in reality present among us at this moment or is likely to come into being. If such a common moral consciousness does exist, a programme on the basis of a single nationality may fall within the sphere of practical politics." (Dr. Latif's "The Cultural Future of India." p. 4). Dr. Latif then goes on to say that no such moral consciousness exists in India. He then reminds us that a common language might have served as a binding force to unite all the people. It is true no doubt that throughout India there is no uniform common language which is spoken and understood by all the people. But no language is the special monopoly of a particular community. Language belongs in India, not to a community but to a locality. There are various languages in India, such as Bengalee, Urdu, Hindi, Tamil, Telegu, Mahratti, Assamese, Oriya, etc., which is the mother-tongue of the people of different provinces. But we are glad to note that language is not co-existing with religion. Each of the languages is used by all the communities of the locality to which it belongs. Thus Bengalee is the language

of both the Hindus and the Muslims. The same may be said with respect to Urdu, Hindi and other languages. To classify the people of India under the head of languages and religions at the same time is to involve the fallacy of Division. All the Hindus of India do not speak one language only, and all the Muslims do not speak a language different from the Hindus. Each province has its own language and almost all the people of that province speak that language irrespective of caste or creed. Therefore the language problem in India is neither a religious nor a cultural problem. The masses have nothing to do with it. What language should be made the 'lingua-franca' of India, is the chief concern of the 'intelligentsia' of the country. If India has a federal form of Government, the deficiency of a common language for the whole of the land will not prove insurmountable in unifying India into one nation. Urdu, Hindi, Bengalee, be that as it may, India must be welded into a single nation if other conditions are fulfilled.

What are the factors that unite the people of a country into a single nation? Let me quote a few lines from notable European authorities on the subject. J. S. Mill says: "A portion of mankind may be said to constitute a nationality if they are united among themselves by common sympathies which do not exist between them and any others—which make them co-operate with each other more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government and desire that it should be governed by themselves or a portion of themselves exclusively". (*Representative Government*). M. Renan declared that it was not community of language and race which makes a people a nation, but the sentiment of a common heritage of memories, whether of achievement and glory or of suffering and sacrifice, together with a desire to live together in the same State and to transmit their heritage to their posterity.

"It is the will of a people to live together, the 'Vouloir-vivre Collectif', says M. Hauser, "and not race or language which makes a nation. It is a union of men inhabiting the same territory, whether or not subject to the same government, and possessing such common interests of long standing that they may be regarded as belonging to the same race." (Littre Dictionnaire, def. 'Nation'.) According to M. Duguit—"That which makes a nation is the consciousness existing at a given time among all the individuals of the same social group, that there is an intimate and profound interdependence between the territory and the population which inhabits it." Lord Bryce defines nation as a nationality which has organised itself into a political body either independent or desirous to be independent. "The bonds which make a people a nation are not necessarily ethnic and linguistic, although these are undoubtedly the most important factors. Thus the Swiss people constitute a nation in the political sense although the population is partly Walloon and partly Flemish and they speak different languages" (Garner). Garner further adds that neither the community of races nor the community of language is absolutely necessary to constitute a nation. Because the science of ethnology has revealed the difficulty of drawing the lines which separate one race from another, since many existing races are mixed in character, that is they have no common origin, but have been formed by a fusion of various races. Though community of religion was once regarded as a mark of nationality, yet in modern times the elements of religious unity is no longer regarded as essential factor to make nation. If other factors are present, religious difference are no bar to bind the different people into one nation. The economic and political bonds are stronger than the separatist influence of religious differences. The beneficial spirit of religious toleration is alone sufficient to destroy the separatist tend-

ency that is found in the different communities of a composite nation. There is another potential factor which is not less important than the others to unite the people of a country into a nation. It is common political aspirations. When the people are subject to a foreign domination, they sometimes aspire to get their independence. And when this aspiration becomes common to all the people, they forget their petty differences and even vital differences too, and mould themselves into a nation.

"More and more", says Garner, "in the recent years it has come to be recognised that it is not so much community of race, language, religion or residence which impresses a people with the character of nationality, as it is the feeling of community of interests and ideals, of "like-mindedness", —as the sociologists say,—the mutual sympathy which comes from the consciousness of wrongs and oppression suffered through common subjection during a long period of time to a despotic government, the pride of a common share in great historic struggles, and the possession of a common heritage and common traditions expressed in songs and ballads." Who is there in India whether among the Hindus and Moslems that does not feel shame and humiliation at hearing of the events of Plassey, Arcot, Giria, Udinala, Katwa and Panipat where all chances of India's freedom were shattered? Do not the events that occurred during the first war of Independence, miscalled the Sepoy Mutiny, evoke a sense of patriotic pride and joy in the minds of the Hindus and the Moslems, not excepting the Mahasabmites and the Moslem Leaguers? This political struggle for Independence that is going in the country for the last fifty years is the common and joint action of the people of India. What soul does there breathe that does not wish to contribute his own share in that struggle? The memories of our past shames and humiliations

as well as our past chivalry and valour are contributing powerfully to the development of a sense of nationality among the different peoples of India. Hindus and Moslems are not enemies, but friends and brothers of the same family with different inclinations in certain matters. The bonds of union and affection between them could not be broken and they cannot separate. In the words of President Lincoln, let me again remind the Hindus and the Moslems of India that "the mystic chords of memory stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

SCHEMES FOR THE PARTITION OF INDIA

Our friends of India and Islam will never rest content until they have divided the country of India into many parts, each independent of the other. We talk of Indian solidarity, and they talk of denying that solidarity, and if there is the faintest prospect of a solidarity, they want to break it into pieces. Schemes after schemes are being put forward by these persons to divide India according to their principles and ideas. They contend that India is a vast country, it is more a continent than a country, and unless and until it is divided into certain definite and well-defined lines, the peace and prosperity of the whole country will be disturbed by internal as well as external troubles. There are communal problems, religious differences, sectarian disturbances, racial jealousy, linguistic rivalries and provincial hatred. Differences on so many things will mar the prospect of a national solidarity. One will quarrel with the other, one community will fall upon the other, one province

will exploit the other—so un-national is the present state of affairs that it is beyond the possibility of practical politics to think of national solidarity. Hence, according to this view, it is good and proper that India should be so divided into several zones or regions that there may not be left the least possibility of quarrels and dissensions. The present physical division of India is unnatural, it cannot ensure better government for the people and therefore it should be done away with, and a natural and proper division should be made so that communal, racial, provincial and linguistic quarrels will be heard no more in the land.

First, in order of time came the Pakistan movement. The founder of this movement is Mr. Rahmat Ali of the Punjab. He chalked out a plan to divide India into two parts —‘Hindu India’ and ‘Muslim India’. According to this plan all those provinces that lie to the west of the river Jamuna will comprise ‘Muslim India’ and the rest will be included into ‘Hindu India’. But this scheme has not found favour with the Muslims in other parts of India. But the ball was set in motion. From that time began a detailed discussion over the question of partition of India. Scheme after scheme was formed and a propaganda work was carried on throughout the country. When the mind of a section of Muslims was prepared to favour the idea of partition, Dr. Latif of Hyderabad came forward with a definite scheme to divide the whole of India into eleven cultural zones. This scheme is more dangerous than the Pakistan scheme, in that while the latter did not touch the Muslims of the other parts of India, the scheme of Dr. Latif has been devised to break the entire solidarity of the country. I need not enter into the discussion of Dr. Latif’s scheme, as I have discussed it in a separate article. The Sind Muslim League in its last Karachi meeting had accepted the principles of Dr. Latif’s scheme. But that was not

deemed enough. While Federation was hanging over the head, something must be done to secure some advantages under it. Just in time came the scheme of Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan, Premier of the Punjab, and a prominent member of the Muslim League. In all these schemes of Partition of India, one thing is conspicuously absent,—the ideal of independence. None of the framers of the schemes has adopted independence as the goal. A free and united India, a national India whose administration will be carried on by the people of India without any intervention of any foreign power is beyond their comprehension. It is curious to find that the framers of these schemes all belong to the communal and reactionary elements of the society. Muslims belonging to the other groups, *i.e.* the Nationalists and the Congressites have strongly denounced the schemes on the ground that they will cut at the root of nationalism and freedom of the country. Their scheme is a direct challenge to democracy or nationalism towards which the country has been moving for the last fifty years. Therefore we should accord the same treatment to the scheme as we do to the other ideals of the Muslim League. An unqualified condemnation is the only attitude that the scheme deserves.

It is melancholy to note that Sir Sikandar's scheme does not go beyond the ideal of Dominion Status. In it he has very carefully avoided the idea of independence. He is more a friend of the Native Princes and a few vested interests. In his anxiety to save the Native States he has refused to touch them and has described the attempts of those who are fighting for the introduction of Reforms in the States as wrong deeds. He wants to retain the absolute autocracy that is prevalent there and leave the subjects to the tender mercies of the rulers. His insistence on the protection of the minorities, gives no light to the scheme. It is the same hackneyed thing, the same catch words that

the communal brand leaders of the type of Mr. Jinnah like to indulge in. The minorities are his first concern and to protect them every means should be adopted even if one has to trample under foot the general well-being of the country. The decision of the minorities should prevail everywhere and a single dissentient vote of the minorities must be sufficient to annul any decision of the majorities. Even in the Cabinet, either of the Province or of the Centre, a certain number of seats should be reserved for the minorities. That is, the system of party government is declared null and void. Party government is the inevitable consequence of all democratic constitutions. But according to Sir Sikandar Hyat this should be avoided by giving the minorities an undue preference. Had there been the system of joint electorate, the demand of reservation of seats had some value. But with separate electorate as the basis of election, no such demand can be conceded if democracy had to be worked successfully. Under the scheme of the valiant Knight of the Punjab a stable government in India would be impossible. Under no federal constitution, the residuary power vests in the units. It always vests in the centre, otherwise the central authority will be a nullity. But Sir Sikandar Hyat has ignored the essential features of federation and has insisted that federal authority shall have no power. As regards the protection of the minorities, I would tell him and men of his way of thinking that it is the declaration of the Fundamental Rights that can protect them, and no statutory safeguards can save them from the tyranny of the majorities. But they have never demanded the Fundamental Rights, which are the only pledges of security of the ordinary citizens from every sort of interference in their everyday work either from the government or from the majority communities. If the minorities cannot protect themselves, all the safeguards and reservations are

powerless to give them any guarantee. The question of services can be settled by mutual agreement, for which a legislative enactment or an interference of the British Parliament is useless and harmful. As regards the protection of language, culture, etc., it is difficult to do anything by relying upon artificial safeguards. Will partition of India on the lines suggested by him, protect language and culture from any danger which might hang over them? It is their inherent strength and all comprehensive nature, that can save culture and language from the onslaught of time. No State protection can save a language, religion or culture. The utmost that is necessary is the right to preserve and protect one's language, religion or culture for which Fundamental Rights are more than sufficient. His scheme cannot solve the communal problem, nor can it allay the suspicion of the minorities. Rather, it will aggravate communal feelings. There is communal problem, but its remedy is not to separate the people into groups or sub-groups once for all, but the real remedy lies in bringing them together and allowing them to live under one rule and one political ideal.

From a perusal of his scheme, no one can fail to detect the inner motive of Sir Sikandar ; it is to establish a sort of Communal Raj over the different parts of India. He wants to partition India into seven zones. But there is neither any logic, nor any sense in that scheme. It has neither any linguistic basis nor any scientific basis. The whole scheme is arbitrary and whimsical. At present there are eleven provinces, and there is a clamour for more provinces. In the face of these demands, Sir Sikandar has reduced the number from eleven provinces to seven. If his scheme be given effect to, there would arise more complications and difficulties. It will never bring peace in the suggested zones. There will be fresh wars of languages,

cultures, creeds and religions. Assam and Bengal, Bihar and Orissa will fall on each other and there will be perpetual quarrels among them. In this way every province will be faced with new problems which will destroy the solidarity of India. On the Western front he wants to create a new Pakistan with the Punjab, Sind, Frontier, Kashmir and Beluchistan. But he will not give Purnea, Santal Parganas, Purulia etc. to Bengal to create a genuine Bengal. This absurd scheme is as bad as the scheme of Dr. Latif and we hope it will meet the same fate as has done the scheme of the learned doctor. We again declare that the partition of India on this line will not solve the communal problem. It will create fresh problems. Like other communal leaders Sir Sikandar believes that the communal problem of India is an eternal problem and so he wants to make it perpetual by dividing India into several zones. But this communal problem is not a permanent phase of the body-politic of India, it is only a passing phase, it will come to an end as soon as India will be free. But as lovers of freedom we do not want such schemes. We have full faith in the capacity of the Indians to secure freedom for their beloved country.

MOTIVE BEHIND THE PARTITION SCHEME

Mr. Jinnah has at last placed his card before the table. After prolonged hesitation, vile vituperations and random rhapsodies, he has at long last come out with a plan for the solution of the communal problem which has so long disturbed the peace and tranquillity of India. It is the easiest thing in the world—vivisect India into two parts, Hindu India and Moslem India so that the Hindus and the Moslems might not have the least chance of seeing one another's face. How easy the solution!—and how ~~easy~~

time and energy of the nation was saved for finding out the solution? Three cheers for the man who has invented it for the good of India! But those who are in the know of the things do not regard the scheme of Mr. Jinnah as an ideal solution for the ills and miseries of India. Sometimes the easiest things are the most impossible things in the world and this scheme is of that nature. Is the scheme the result of deep thought, penetrating insight and sound judgment? Who are the persons that have laboured for the scheme? And what are their past records, what have they done for the good of the country? What sacrifices have they made for the cause of India? When have they become free from the influence of high British authorities? If these people draw up a scheme for the betterment of India, can it be beneficial for the people in the long run? The scheme of Mr. Jinnah is not only destructive of healthy growth of nationalism in India but, it will also ruin the cause of the Moslems for whose benefit it is supposed to have been drawn up.

From an analysis of the political condition of India of the last three decades one can fairly come to the conclusion that Mr. Jinnah's scheme of partition of India is not an isolated phenomenon by itself. Other facts and factors are so closely connected with it that no doubt is left in the mind that the present scheme is the culminating point of various other schemes that preceded it. It had its origin in the sinister 'divide and rule' policy that was adopted long ago by Lord Curzon. Since that time this policy has taken a definite shape. Sometimes the initiative was taken by the higher authorities and sometimes some hints were dropped and the cue was taken by some of our so-called popular leaders. And by careful handling things so shaped themselves as it were in their own way, that the ordinary people could not know the real mystery lying behind the

curtain. Mr. Jinnah's scheme is of this nature. It has got the blessing of the entire British public.

To understand the inner motives that are working behind the scheme, one has to traverse the whole history of British India from the days of Partition of Bengal down to the present time. In proportion as the national struggle for freedom began to take serious turn, the 'divide and rule' policy of the rulers also took definite shapes. It was only to crush the political movement of Bengal that the 'Partition of Bengal' scheme was invented by the higher authorities. The motive of that scheme was clearly laid down by the *Statesman* (Calcutta) of those days which says:—“The objects of the Partition of Bengal are firstly to destroy the collective power of the Bengali people. Secondly, to overthrow the political ascendancy of Calcutta and thirdly, to foster in East Bengal the growth of a Moslem power which it is hoped will have the effect of keeping in check the rapidly growing strength of the educated Hindu community.” That scheme had its desired effects. The measure was fatally designed to create Hindu-Moslem division, for while it was meant to crush the Hindus, it was seemingly calculated to benefit the Moslems at their expense. The feelings between the Hindus and the Moslems were exasperated and the partition widened the gulf between them. The Moslems were yet too dormant politically ('are they not even to-day?') to have been able to understand the full significance of such a measure. A Moslem province —where the Moslems would rule and keep the Hindus under their heel—that was the consolation of the Moslems. What Sir Henry Cotton, an ex-Chief Commissioner of Assam says on the effect of the Partition of Bengal is worthy of note: “The opportunity was taken by evilly disposed persons with head-quarters at Dacca to scatter emissaries throughout the country preaching the revival of Islam, advocating t

wildest schemes and proclaiming to the villagers that the British Government was on their side and would exact no penalties for violence done to the Hindus. Throughout the country districts there reigned a general terror." (Compare the present condition of the Noakhali Hindus under the Huq regime). Thus it was found out that the 'divide and rule' policy did not fail in its objects. Being emboldened by the Partition Scheme, our rulers began to think as to how to perpetuate the separatist tendency in every walk of the life of the people and the system of separate electorate was invented. About this time it was whispered into the ears of some responsible Moslem leaders that they would be greatly benefited if they would demand separate electorate. The deputation of October 1906 that waited upon Lord Minto demanded that in the future Reforms separate electorate for the Moslems should be made a part of the constitution. (Moulana Mohammed Ali's speech at Coconada Congress). It was to press forward this demand of separate electorate that the Moslem League came into being. Thus we find that the seed of the Scheme of Partition of India was first sown at Dacca in 1906 and it took full 34 years to shape its growth which reached its culminating point at Lahore in 1940.

None in India can bless the Scheme of Mr. Jinnah except the Britishers and a handful of their henchmen, as it is calculated to destroy the very foundation of Indian Society, so assiduously built up by our forefathers. The Scheme of Mr. Jinnah will serve two purposes: first it would create a country-wide agitation which would embitter the feelings of the people and secondly it would estrange a large number of Moslems from the struggle for freedom. No doubt it was a day for the gratification of those who want to see India tied to the chariot-wheel of British imperialism, for the plant they had nurtured with such care, had borne fruit and

a Moslem educated society had come into existence which could be effectively used as a counter-poise to the Hindu educated society. Already germs of disruption are on the air,—a Moslem now regards a Hindu as the enemy of his faith and a Hindu began to regard him as the enemy of the country. All these things are the evil effects of Mr. Jinnah's separation policy. It is true that this separatist policy became ineffective during the Khilafat and Non-Co-Operation agitation. But as the germs of disruption were there, these national movements could not blend the Hindus and the Moslems into one bond. As soon as the agitation became a little slackened, troubles arose again with the result that the Hindus and the Moslems found them again placed in opposite camps. When the Congress took office in eight provinces the League leaders found out the truth that separate electorate was an error. It could not give them the desired thing. The Government which gave them separate electorates did not come in to help them against the majority community. A full-fledged party Government was established in eight provinces, where separate electorate was ineffective to all intents and purposes. What could the Moslem League do then? They took resort to false propaganda against the Congress which spread like wild fire throughout the country. From that time onward a ceaseless agitation was carried out against the Congress and with much trumpet the story of oppression of the Moslems by the Congress was invented. And when the mind of the Moslems was poisoned against Hindu domination, Mr. Jinnah with the aid of his reactionary forces to add insult to injury, drew out his notorious scheme of Partition of India. Thirty-four years ago there was the scheme of Partition of Bengal where the Moslems were the central figure and the same scheme on a wider basis is on the anvil of the League where also the Moslems have to take a ^{entral part.} Thus

the history of 35 years of Indian struggle for freedom will show to a man in the street that a deep-rooted conspiracy was working all throughout these years to foment unrest among the Moslems.

But Mr. Jinnah must know that whatever rosy picture he holds out before the Moslems, very soon a day would come when the Moslems will be thrown to the winds just as they were thrown away by the annulment of the Partition of Bengal. Moulana Mohammed Ali's comment on the Partition of Bengal deserves special notice at this hour. He says: "The benighted and uneducated Mussalmans wanted the Partition to remain unaltered. But really I never believed in that Partition. Only I ask you to realise the fact that this Government had to call upon the Moslems to fight as its auxiliaries against the Hindus in Bengal. Undoubtedly the Partition of Bengal was most unjust and carried out in the most vindictive spirit of Lord Curzon,—yet when the Government found that things were getting too hot for it, it dropped the Moslems like a hot potato. Never was a more ignoble betrayal perpetuated in the whole history of Indian politics. *Nothing could have more clearly convinced them that their dependence upon a foreign Government for support as against sister communities, laid them perpetually open to such betrayals. They now realised that they could place no reliance on such support whether at home or abroad, and it set them thinking that perhaps at a much smaller sacrifice of their interests they could purchase lasting peace and even secure the friendship of their neighbours and fellow countrymen.*" (Speech at the Coconada Congress). Mr. Jinnah's scheme may have the support of Britain. But I request the Moslems of India to consider the entire scheme in the light of the experience they have got from the political history of India during the last forty years. Is it to help the cause of imperialism

theories and ideologies, they simply declare that by Pakistan they simply mean a redistribution of provinces. But when they approach the masses who are generally fanatically minded they tell a different tale—they assure them of the creation of an Islamic state. India was taken from the Muslims ; at least a portion of it should be restored to the Muslims. Then all the glories of Islam during the last thirteen hundred years are conjured up before their mind. The masses are fed up with the hope of establishing the same position of glory through Pakistan. "Who is the greatest obstacle in this holy attempt? It is not the British Government ; it is the Hindus of India who are persistently opposing the Pakistan scheme. The Hindus are going to establish Hindu Raj, will you live under the Hindu Raj? Let the Hindus have their Raj and let us, the Muslims have our own Raj". In this way the Pakistan idea is being preached throughout the country. Up till now no proper care was taken to give a systematic and uniform opinion about the Pakistan scheme. Why this vagueness and multifarious views about a thing which to them is the essence of existence? Because they do not know what they want. They want to create disturbances and in this they have been successful. They simply spread the idea and things began to shape themselves according to certain laws of causation. But a rational mind could not be satisfied with that haphazard manner. It must demand a consistent and scientific principle upon which you should base your ideas. Therefore the scheme should be considered from political, economic and religious points of view. First of all I shall take up the political aspect of Pakistan and try to see whether it is desirable under the given circumstances to divide India into two parts.

In considering the Pakistan scheme several questions come up before our mind. Why do the League leaders want

Pakistan? What harm was there to remain tied to united India? If India is separated into Hindu India and Muslim India, will the non-Muslims be allowed to remain in Muslim India, and non-Hindus in Hindu India? Is the scheme of exchange of population included in Pakistan programme? If not, then what is the necessity of Pakistan? What would then be the position of those Muslims who will have to live in Hindu India and of those Hindus who will have to live in Muslim India? What safeguards and special protection can you give to the different communities in these communal states? If the protections and safeguards under the Communal Award are not sufficient, then what more assurances of safeguard can you give to the minorities that will be forced to live under Pakistan or Hindustan? But if you want a change of population, have you considered its difficulties and absurdities? If the League leaders can give a satisfactory answer to these questions, then they can make out a *prima facie* case for Pakistan. Otherwise the entire scheme would fall to the ground. In supporting the Pakistan Mr. Jinnah has put before us a very fallacious argument. If the Hindus apprehend oppression from the Muslims in the Pakistan, are not the Muslims justified in apprehending oppression from the Hindus in united India where they will be majority? But a counter question does not solve a difficulty. It simply aggravates difficulty. Our point is, if the solution of the minority problem is the essence of Pakistan, it will not solve the problem in any way. It will create fresh problem which will endanger the safety of each state. It is certain that in united India, the Hindus will be majority, but that majority will never be united under one flag. There are parties and classes among the Hindus, many of which will be guided more by economic and political ideals than by sectarian ideals. Hence Hindu majority in united India will be no menace.

to the Muslims, rather they might have every chance of becoming a deciding factor in many matters. The Muslim minority might be supreme even in united India by tactfully handling the situation.

All the League leaders from the biggest to the lowest hold the view that the Hindus are untrustworthy. They would crush the Muslims if the hands of the Britishers are taken away from the Indian soil. It is only to allay the suspicion of the Muslims and also to solve the complicated communal problem that the Pakistan Scheme had been devised. The Hindus and the Muslims are so inimical to each other that it is impossible for them to live in the same country and under the same rule. So let there be separate states for the Muslims as well as for the Hindus, so that the Muslims and the Hindus have full liberty to develop their states according to their religious ideas. But the difficulty is that Mr. Jinnah does not like the idea of exchange of population at this stage. Therefore there will be Muslims in Hindu states and Hindus in Muslim states, as minority community. Thus it would be found that even in Pakistan the minority problem will be there and therefore all those safeguards, reservations and special responsibilities of the Governor and Viceroy will be there. If that is the ultimate destiny of Pakistan, what better solution of the minority problem can it give to us than that is in vogue at present in India when the minorities have got all the safeguards and reservations according to their desire. If the minorities are tortured and persecuted by the majorities, what guarantee can there be that the latter would not do the same in divided India. If the present safeguard is useless, the safeguards in Hindu India and Muslim India will also be useless. Then also there will be loud clamour for protection from the oppression of the majority community and as result of these protests more safeguards will be

granted. The present safeguards have curtailed the liberties of the responsible ministers. In the same way the safeguards in the Pakistan will do away with many of the liberties of the Muslim states. The more safeguards, the less liberty, that is the motive behind the principle of safeguard. In the Hindu states where unfortunately a large number of Muslims will have to live, the latter will be put to great difficulties because of Hindu majority. How would the Muslims in the Hindu provinces feel secure? Will they be left at the mercy of wolves and tigers, simply for the good of Muslims of different countries far away from their land? Then again, the Muslims in the Pakistan will not fare well in any way. They will have a Muslim-raj in name only. For the protection of the non-Muslims their power and authority will be curtailed in various ways. If the Hindus and other non-Muslims are allowed to live in the Pakistan, they might form a solid phalanx against the Muslims, or might form a non-communal party with certain economic programme to which a large number of Muslims might join. This new party might frustrate the Muslim solidarity and it might even control the whole administration. It might even agitate against Pakistan and nullify the whole thing, and unite that part of India with the rest of the country. The advantages that the minorities are getting to-day must have to be granted to them in the Pakistan,—separate electorate, reservation in services, education and other advantages will have to be conceded to the non-Muslim minorities. If the Hindus to-day are untrustworthy, what guarantee can there be in Hindu India that they would treat the Muslims properly? The Leaguers might think of retribution. But why should the Hindus of Pakistan be punished for the offence of other people in other land over whom they could have no control? Similarly why should the Hindus of Hindu India persecute ~~simply~~ simply

on the pretext that their fellow-brothers are being persecuted in the Pakistan? Hence if oppression ever takes place, it will be one-sided against which no precautionary measures can be reserved except the curtailment of freedom. In no part of divided India will oppression cease, rather it will be multiplied in various ways. If this is the effect of Pakistan what good can it bring to the Muslims?

The hope and desire that in the proposed Pakistan the Muslims will be able to shape their destiny according to the law, culture and religion of Islam will be frustrated to the great bewilderment of its leaders. How could it be possible if the non-Muslims are allowed to live in the Pakistan? Similarly the Hindus will not be able to develop their society according to their laws, customs and culture and religion. Because there will live many non-Hindus in Hindu India. If you insist on making laws on religious basis, then there will be two sets of laws, one for the Hindus and one for the Muslims or other communities. In such vital things as Civil, Military and Criminal laws, there cannot be any uniform standard. Muslim civil court and Hindu civil court, Muslim criminal court and Hindu criminal court—these will crop up in the country which in the long run will destroy the unity of the people. Then for the foreigners and other inter-communal matters there will be "Capitulation", and the "Capitulation" will of necessity bring in the foreign influence for the protection of the minority interest. Turkey, Egypt and other Near Eastern countries had got bitter experiences of "Capitulation" and other galling restrictions.

The Pakistan instead of becoming a blessing, will be burden upon the entire Muslims of India, as it will harden their slavery and will necessitate the constant presence of a third party in the land. In order to drive away the Hindu influences, the Muslims of the Pakistan will be placed in

a precarious position. If equal rights of citizenship be not given to the Hindus, they will create constant troubles. No repressive laws will be able to crush this spirit of resistance. Thus we see that Pakistan will not solve any problem—nor will it liberate the country from foreign control. Then remains the question of exchange of population which is not only impossible but harmful too. How could a man give up his hearth and home and migrate to another land and settle there for ever? Climate, language and manners and modes of living will not suit him. The new-comers will not receive a hospitable home in the Pakistan, nor will they be treated equally with the original inhabitants. Whatever the League leaders might say about Pakistan, it will remain an ideal dream.

ECONOMIC ASPECT OF PAKISTAN

It is very difficult to say whether the demand of Pakistan is merely a stunt for acquiring further concessions in communalism like the Fourteen Points of Mr. Jinnah, the substantial points of which have already been granted to the Moslims through the Communal Award, or it is clever hint of the imperialistic power to keep alive the dying embers of communalism which might have met its timely death after the declaration of the Award. Pakistan may be possible or impossible, it may be good or bad, the Britishers might grant it or reject it, that is a different thing. If it comes into being the only question we will have to consider is what will be its economic effect upon the new Moslim India that will be created out of the demand of Pakistan. We may leave aside for the present, the economic effect of Pakistan on the whole of India, because the Moslim Leaguers do not want to think of the interest of the whole country. India may fall or die, she might remain a slave country or

a free country, that is not their concern. Their only concern is the Moslems of India and it is for their interests that they want Pakistan. Therefore we shall consider the economic aspect of Pakistan from that point of view. Do you want Pakistan at any cost for the benefit of the Moslems? If you want it at any cost, then no ground is necessary for its support. But if you want it for the benefit of the Moslems, then certainly its economic aspect should be considered. Therefore the most vital question is, will it be economically beneficial and desirable for the Moslems to have Pakistan? If it is proved to be sound, economically and financially, then its acceptance might have some meaning. But if it is found out to be the most unsound thing from financial point of view, then what good can it bring to the Moslems who will have to live under Pakistan. The richness of a country depends largely on the following things: Fertility of the soil, large water supply, trade, commerce and industry, transport and market facilities for selling goods and products, etc., etc. Our Moslim League leaders ought to consider all these things many times before they launch a struggle for Pakistan.

At present there are eleven provinces in India,—they have been granted Provincial autonomy under a central Government, viz., the Government of India, with the Viceroy as its executive head. Through various channels the Central Government of India, receives a large amount of money from these eleven provinces, e.g., Income tax, incomes from Post, Telegraph and Railway departments, etc., etc. The India Government in return contribute certain amount of money to the Provincial Governments according to their needs. But the contribution of the Central Government is not in proportion to that it takes from the Provincial Governments. And why? Because there are certain provinces which are deficit provinces e.g., Sind, Frontier Provinces.

It is impossible for these provinces to carry on their Government on their own income without outside help. Other provinces, such as Punjab, and Bengal are not surplus provinces. The Governments of these provinces are constantly handicapped for want of money. Scarcely will they get any surplus money with which they might help others after meeting their necessary expenditure. An analysis of the sources of revenue that fill the treasury of the India Government will show that the Hindu Provinces taken together contribute the largest amount to the central exchequer. The quota of seven Hindu provinces must necessarily be higher than the four Moslim provinces of which two are perpetually deficit provinces. Almost all the provinces of India are being taxed to their utmost capacity. Any fresh taxation not for the nation building department of the provinces itself, but to supply the deficit amount to another province, is height of folly, nay it is even suicidal. No people can support it. Rebellion, insurrection, and lastly revolution will resist such an attempt of any Government that would tax its people for the benefit of the other people outside their jurisdiction. Now let us see what might be the possible economic effect of the Pakistan on the four or five Moslim Provinces including Beluchistan. Suppose that Bengal, the Punjab, Sind, Frontier Provinces and Beluchistan are brought under one federation and a Moslim raj is established over them. The remaining seven provinces are brought under another federation, called Hindu India. And at once the quota of Hindu provinces will be transferred to the Central Government of the Hindu Federation. The contribution that the four or five Moslim Provinces will make to the central Government of Muslim federation, will be so small after meeting the necessary expenditure, the latter cannot afford to supply sufficient money to the deficit provinces of Sind, Frontier and Beluchistan. These deficit provinces will have to suffer perpe-

tually for want of money. We admit that the Punjab and Bengal are not deficit provinces ; but their revenues are not so large as would enable them to make up the deficiency of the above three provinces. The mere sentiment that to help those provinces is to serve the cause of Islam will not encourage them in this respect. And even if the Punjab and Bengal want to help them they will themselves be turned into deficit provinces. Why should the Punjab and Bengal go to help Sind and the Frontier when their Governments will not be able to manage their own affairs for want of money? If Sind and Frontier are separated from the United India, where will they go? Who will supply their deficiencies? Will the Central Government of Muslim Federation come forward with their money and other helps to keep them alive? The Moslim Federation shorn of Hindu help will be itself a deficit Central Government and will have to depend entirely on contribution from British exchequer at London, because there are no other sources of revenue. If you want to drain too much from Bengal and the Punjab, these two provinces will starve and will have to die of starvation in the midst of plenty like Tantalus of old legend. Thus under Pakistan, all the Moslim provinces will be placed in a most miserable condition. On the one hand we will find that the Hindu India will flourish in wealth and plenty, and on the other hand will be found Moslim India dying in poverty and starvation. You might say that some voluntary contribution will remove the misery of the Moslim India. But you cannot keep a nation perpetually better off through donation and charity. Charity is possible only in emergent cases, such as cyclone, flood and famine. But a Government cannot be run on with the help of voluntary contribution of the individual members of the society.

Either our leaders do not know all these difficulties of Pakistan, or they are wilfully misleading the Moslim masses

for their own sordid motives. Otherwise they would have thought of the problem of defences of India from the Western Frontiers, against foreign invasion. Will Moslim India alone be able to defend the Frontiers if some mighty enemy invades India? Without Hindu help from Hindu India they cannot move a step to drive away the invading enemy. For defence of a country men, money, arm and ammunition are necessary. Will Moslim India with the help of a few Punjabi wariors be able to guard the Frontiers. The Punjab may supply the man power, but on whom will you depend for arm, money, and ammunition! It is United India alone, that can defend the Frontiers from foreign invasion. If you have to rely upon Hindu India for defences, then where is the scope for Pakistan? Is it not evaporated into the air at the slightest thought of foreign invasion? Then as regards the richness of the land and other causes of prosperity of the country, it will be found that almost all the best places will be situated in Hindu India. Industrial and mill areas, arable lands, coastal towns, mine areas, trade routes—these and hundred other advantageous positions will fall into Hindu India. Karachi and Chittagong will be the only ports that will fall to the lot of Moslim India. But better port towns, and coastal lands with better facilities for world trade will be controlled by Hindu India. We admit that Bengal is a rich province, but it has a large Hindu population, who will not be negligible minority. You cannot deceive their eyes and do anything at their back. In that case they will raise hue and cry and will endanger your safety at every step. Because it is against their will that you will have your Pakistan. Judge the Pakistan from any point of view, you will find that it is not only harmful for the whole country, even the Moslims will be the greatest sufferers under it. They will be rackrented and their economic condition will be worse than ever.

PAKISTAN AND THE MASSES

The supporters of the Pakistan scheme have so much enamoured a certain class of Moslems by using some oft-repeated catchwords such as Moslim solidarity, Moslim raj, Moslim homeland that they do not enter deep into the various intricate difficulties that are inherent in that preposterous scheme. The Moslim upper and middle classes have been fed up with the idea that under Pakistan they would get greater facilities for improvement and better scope for employment. As it would create a purely Moslim raj they would be the most favoured class under it. But the leaders and the supporters of the scheme have entirely forgot to consider the miserable condition of the Moslim masses. They failed to enlighten us as to how it would improve the condition of the masses, how it would drive away their age-long poverty, misery and ignorance. By pitying the plumage they have thought it best to ignore the dying bird. It is our considered view that if ever Pakistan comes into being, the condition of the masses will not improve, but will be worse than ever. The interest of the masses are always antagonistic to the interest of the upper classes, whether they belong to the Moslim or Hindu. What the combined forces of Hindu and Moslim masses could do, would not be possible by the single-handed struggle of one group of people only. To assert the right of the masses a combined effort of the Hindu masses and the Moslim masses is necessary. But if they are separated and are placed in a different state under different status and environment, they would get little scope for united action with the result that they would easily be the victim of the upper class people.

The way in which communalism has developed in India is greatly strengthening the hold of the capitalistic and upper

class people upon the masses and the Pakistan is the culmination of the principle of 'status quo' in all matters relating to private ownership of property.

What does communal solidarity mean? It simply means the solidarity of the upper classes of the society over the unorganised masses. The upper classes are always organised on economic principle, but the masses are kept disorganised by them for their own sordid motive. Under no condition will the masses be benefited by communal solidarity. It is the vital interest of the upper classes to see that the masses are kept in superstition, bigotry and fanatical sentiment. Any attempt of the masses to organise themselves into a solid body on economic basis will be crushed by the upper classes. The Hindu upper classes and the Moslim upper classes will try to consolidate the Hindu masses and the Moslim masses under their respective banners. And hence the Hindu and Moslim masses will get little chance of making a common cause on any matter for their welfare. They will be exploited for ever by their upper class leadership. The division of the country into Hindu India and Moslim India will cut off all connecting links that exists between the Hindu masses and the Moslim masses. The Pakistan will aggravate the misery of the Moslim masses in various ways. It will strengthen and perpetuate the overlordship of the Moslim upper classes over the Moslim lower classes.

The Moslim leaders always hold the view that the interest of the Moslim masses are always different from those of the Hindu masses. So the Moslim masses will have to live under the protection of the Moslim leaders in a separate Moslim state, and the Hindu masses will have to live under a Hindu state. Why do they say such foolish things? Because they know that a day might come when the Moslim and the Hindu masses will unite together and throw off the leadership of the upper classes. It is to avoid that situation

that the Pakistanists have invented this novel method to separate the Moslem masses from the Hindu masses. If ever it takes place, it will postpone or delay the mass movement. In the meantime the upper class leaders will get ten-fold benefits. First their private property will remain secure, and secondly their leadership will be insured for many days to come. But Pakistan or no Pakistan the condition of the masses will remain in the same position as it is to-day, if they do not follow a different path. In United India the masses shall have greater chance of mobilization and unity than in divided India. Under Pakistan the Moslim masses will be lying prostrate before the iron heel of the upper class Moslims. The conception of equality and fraternity of Islam will not improve their condition. The conception of private ownership of property being an integral part of Islam, the Islamic ideal of equality will be in most cases chimerical and illusory. The Islamic 'Zakat' and 'Fitra' and other charitable injunctions will only swell the number of beggars and beneficiaries, they will not advance the causes of the masses. Because the present maladjustment of wealth will not be disturbed under the Pakistan and the Pakistanists are very keen about it. Any movement of the masses for that purpose will be ruthlessly crushed by the upper class Moslims in the name of Islam and Moslim solidarity. Thus separated from the Hindu masses, the Moslim masses will be placed under the perpetual control of the Moslim upper class people. On the one hand the Pakistan will cause poverty and degradation to the masses, and on the other hand it will increase prestige and dignity of the upper class Moslims. Thus we see that under Pakistan the masses will be the worst sufferers, and their economic condition will be worse than ever.

From the declared policy of the Moslim League with regard to its economic ideal, we can safely conclude that

nder Pakistan the vested interests of Zamindars, landlords and capitalist classes will remain intact. Mr. Jinnah's very insistence on the problem of minority protection contains the germ of assurance that he would protect and safeguard the minority interest of the zemindars and capitalist classes. What does it mean? It simply means that the Pakistan government will not allow the people to disturb the present economic order of society. Therefore under Pakistan the zamindary system and capitalistic system will get fresh lease of life. Together with other reactionary demands Mr. Jinnah has again and again laid emphasis on these two demands also viz: (1) that no one will be allowed to make any agitation to change the nature of Government in the Muslim states; (2) all the Zamindary and religious endowments of the Moslems will be statutorily protected. It is only a person imbued with capitalistic idealism that can make such a terrible demand. It simply shows that the Muslim League has no programme of work for the masses. In 1936 when the Muslim League was reconstituted at Bombay, Mr. Jinnah had inserted the following proposal in creed of the Muslim League: "Muslim League under no condition will forfeit the private property of the individual". If this be the principle of the Muslim League, how can it improve the condition of the masses when Pakistan will come into being? It is certain that under Pakistan the Moslem masses will be majority and the Moslem vested interest will be a hopeless minority, but all wealth will be concentrated in the latter's hand. According to the League theory of minority protection, the Pakistan Government will be bound to give statutory protection to the vested interest of the Muslim minority (that is capitalist class). And at whose expense will such protection be given to the minority? Certainly it is at the expense of the Moslem masses. For the masses in Pakistan will be a purgatory—a veritable hell on earth.

FROM THE MUSLIM LEAGUE FRONT

When sensational war news from the Western Front in Europe is pouring in our country, we forget that in the very door of our house there is another battle-field the news of which is not less important and sensational. I mean the news from the Muslim League front, where our valiant General Field Marshal Mr. M. A. Jinnah has been carrying on a ceaseless war against the Congress. In the heat and bustle of European war we little care about the news from the Muslim League front. But in magnitude and vastness and in its devastating propensity, it is not less interesting than the news from the Western Front. The Muslim League's declaration of war began long before the rumbling cannon balls were heard in Europe. Acceptance of office by the Congress four years ago, was the signal for a deathless and ceaseless battle against the Congress. Valiant League leaders marshalled their forces on the field and spread war in the country, and its fury and terror threatened the very existence of the Congress. They had their war councils to combat "Bande Mataram" and "Vidya Mandir Scheme". They had their volunteer corps to check the Congress organisations. They would certainly have raised the very structure of the Congress to the ground and forced it to capitulate on their own terms, but the Congress ministers resigned and they were deprived of an opportunity of showing their strength and power. With resignation of the Congress ministers, all fear of suppression of Moslem nation was gone and Muslim India heaved a sigh of relief. Would not then a thanksgiving day be observed for this, as merciful Providence has delivered them from the clutches of the Hindus? Through pomp and pageantry a certain

day was observed as a deliverance day just as the ancient Israelites did when they were delivered from the oppression of Pharaoh. Then followed a period of stagnation when valiant soldiers of the Muslim League retired to their places to take a well-earned rest. But the generals and vice-generals of the Muslim League were not sitting idly. They were thinking of how to launch a fresh attack against the Congress and all that for which the Congress stands. And then came Pakistan agitation. By making Pakistan a new issue, a fresh war was declared against the Congress and the whole forces of the Muslim League were concentrated on it. Call it a "Blitzkrieg", or a heavy tank fight—the war on the Pakistan Scheme is indeed a terrible war. It has upset the best mind of India. The fight is still going on and we are awaiting in complete suspense for the final result. Every war has its successes and reverses and so has the war of the Muslim League. In the first few months it has met with tremendous success. But suddenly, and I would say quite unexpectedly, approached an enemy—the Azad Moslem Conference which gave a stout resistance to the advancing army of the Muslim League. So long the Muslim Leaguers were fighting unchallenged, but the Azad Moslems gave them fight at every point. They challenged the Pakistan Scheme, they cut at the very root of the anti-democratic policy of the Muslim League and they opposed the utter hollowness and rottenness of the entire Muslim League organisation. And now it has been proved that the League represents only a few interested persons of the upper class Moslems but the vast majority of the Moslems have set their face against it.

In the midst of this war some of the League leaders thought that a truce was necessary. A few days ago Mr. Sikandar and Mr. Fazlul Huq, the two most notorious potentiaries of the Muslim League on the ^{other} side,

approached to Rashtrapati Azad to find out ways and means as to make an end of the present impasse between the Congress and the League. Among many things the question of composite cabinet in Provinces must have been discussed by them. And what transpired between them is not known to us. But those of the Leaguers who want to fight, refused to have anything to do with the negotiation. Siddiquis and Ispahanis at once rose up in arm against Mr. Fazlul Huq and Sir Sikandar and warned their followers not to put any faith in them. In the meantime the League dictator held a cabinet meeting at Bombay where he laughed out the idea of a settlement with the Congress and enjoyed his adherents not to talk with the Congress leaders without previously consulting him. But what disciplinary action does Mr. Jinnah want to take against the Bengal and Punjab Premiers who had a heart to heart talk with the Congress President is not known to us. But the attitude of these two Moslim Leaguers towards the League discipline is one of defiance and non-chalance. The fact is that neither in Bengal nor in the Punjab there is anything like League ministry. Therefore the Premiers of these two Provinces do not care about the discipline of the Moslim League. They follow their own ways and they do not abide by the decision of the Moslim League. If the position of the Moslim League be such that even its valiant champions do not strictly follow its rules and regulations, then what right has Mr. Jinnah to claim for the Moslim League to be the sole representative organisation of the Indian Moslims? An organisation of the '*Jo-hukums and apkewastes*' cannot be the organisation of the millions of toiling Moslim masses whose interests are diametrically opposed to that of the leaders of the Moslim League. The League represents nobody except a handful of armchair politicians and their satellites.

Now that a Congress-League peace parley is again on the

air, it is not out of place here to say a few words about the cause of its failure in the past. Vigorous attempts were made by the Congress leaders to make an end of all communal troubles by conceding to the Moslims as many points as were possible under the given circumstances. The whole world knows that it is the League dictator who has banged all doors of settlement against the Congress by raising unimportant and minor issues. We again insist that unless the Moslim League gives up the stand it has now taken up no settlement can be made with it, either by the Congress or by the nationalist Moslims. We are glad that the Congress authorities have understood the motives of the Moslim League. How can there be any coalition with it when the differences are fundamental and vital. It is against all canons of democracy and national ideals. In the provincial legislatures where the Congress is in minority, it did not hanker after coalition cabinet. It strongly refused to join the Allah Baksh ministry under any condition, although the Congress was again and again invited to join it. Why then the Moslim League be hankering after Coalition ministries in the seven provinces? The greatest obstacle to the formation of Coalition ministries in the provinces is the existence of the principles of separate electorate, which means that the parties elected on communal ticket should have no obligation to the nation as a whole. How can those who claim to represent the nation take into their confidence those people who are opposed to the idea of one nation in India? Separate electorate existing, the question of Coalition is unthinkable.

We do not know what will be the fate of India after the Great War in Europe. But the war that has been declared in India by the Moslim League is soon coming to a close. The League has been exposed, its leaders have been exposed and all its motives, principles and ideals have been tried

under the severest crucible and have been found to be utterly rotten and unworkable. The League in spite of its bombastic utterances can deliver the goods neither to the Moslems nor to India as a whole. "*Ignore the Moslem League*" that is the only attitude that it deserves from the people of India.

BURY THE PAKISTAN PLAN

The redoubtable Muslim League dictator Mr. Jinnah might lie the flattering unction to his soul at the news that the Muslims of India have solemnly observed the Muslim State day on the 1st of November 1940. But the whole world knows that the observance of the Muslim State day was a dismal failure, just as the "Deliverance and Thanksgiving Day" last year proved to be hopelessly ludicrous. This year also Mr. Jinnah's hopes were utterly frustrated. Excepting a few enthusiastic supporters of the League who want to make a parade of their love for Islam, none of the Muslims of India had anything to do with this hoax of Mr. Jinnah. In most places of India no meeting was held to observe the day and where it was held, the attendance was so thin that the League leaders thought it prudent not to give wide publicity to the event. And the reason is obvious. The Indian Muslims have learned the futility of interfering in the affairs of the Muslim States of other countries. This sort of extra-territorial patriotism serves neither, the cause of the Indian Muslims, nor of the Muslim States beyond India. It is futile nay foolish to give attention to the Muslims of other countries, when our countrymen are dying of hunger and disease before our eyes. Besides, what can a slave people like us do for the welfare of the free people of the Near Eastern Muslim countries in the event of

attack from their enemies. In these days pious wishes without any tangible help are worse than nothing. The political problem of India and of the other Muslim States is so different from each other and sometimes are so opposed to each other that the people of one country cannot even send pious wishes to that of the other without proving traitor to their own country. In these days of international anarchy and insecurity, it is difficult to know which of the Muslim States will remain friendly or inimical to India. Even some of the Muslim States may turn hostile to India for the furtherance of their own ends. In that case how can we help that State or pray for its security? Hence the observance of the Muslim State day is foolish and senseless and is against the accepted principles and canons of democracy. Leaving the Muslim world to their fate, we should concentrate our whole strength on our own country and do all that we can for improving our condition. In spite of frittering his energies in this fruitless manner if Mr. Jinnah had given us proper lead to liberate our country, he would have done greater benefits to the Indian Muslims than by that senseless method. But it is reassuring to find that Mr. Jinnah's present advice has fallen on deaf ears and so the Muslim State day has failed dismally.

The international crisis of the present day world has not yet opened the eyes of Mr. Jinnah. When empire and smaller States are tottering before the mighty arms of the greater powers, Mr. Jinnah has not forgotten his pet scheme of Pakistan. But Mr. Jinnah is made of different stuff. He will have Pakistan even if it is beset with dangers and difficulties. And Mr. Jinnah must know that if ever the scheme of Pakistan emerges into being, the Muslims will not be benefited by it in any way. Nor will it benefit the Hindus. The Pakistan will estrange Hindus from the Muslims and will make them our inveterate enemies. The Hindus are a people

with whom we have been inhabiting this sacred land for the last seven hundred years. But now out of this Pakistan issue, there must be a permanent breach between us to the great advantage of our enemies. Just as out of a quarrel over a plot of family land, two brothers fall out at each other and ultimately plunge themselves in unnecessary litigation and when one is ruined, the other abandons his ancestral place for ever in wrath and disgust,—so also over the present controversy of Pakistan, there will be a breach of friendship between the Hindus and the Muslims and ultimately none will be benefited by it. Indian Muslims are fully aware of the evil effects of the Pakistan and so they are not enthusiastic about it. They do not show the same fervour and enthusiasm in their support of the Pakistan as is shown in the cases of the other demands, (e.g. services and weightages etc.) of the Muslim League. They know that the demand of Pakistan is a dodge, a stunt, a trick, to get better and greater advantages and facilities from the Congress and other organisations. The failure of the Muslim State day and the Pakistan day unmistakably show that the Indian Muslims are not eager about the Pakistan or the safety of the Near Eastern countries. We can boldly say that if a plebiscite is taken over it, other issues not being involved in it, the Muslim League will be floored before the united vote of the anti-Pakistani Muslims. But the Muslim League will never accept the challenge, because they know that the Muslims in their heart of hearts do not want Pakistan. It is our belief that even if the Muslim League is returned with a large majority its leaders will not press the claim of Pakistan seriously. They will only try to get more advantages by raising that issue and will not proceed further. It is a strange phenomenon that while in the open session of the Muslim League the demand of Pakistan was passed unanimously, many individual Muslim League members do not

like it, nor do they desire that India should be divided according to the scheme of Pakistan. Ask an individual Muslim League, why did you then vote for Pakistan? At once the reply will come, "I could not help" Not to speak of others even the late Sir Mohammed Iqbal who is regarded as one of the framers of the scheme, confessed to a European friend of his that personally he did not like it, but he supported it because the Muslim League supported it. A quotation from Mr. Edward Thompson's famous book "Enlist India for Freedom" will not be out of place here. Mr. Thompson thought that Sir Iqbal supported the Pakistan but it was Sir Iqbal who had corrected him. Sir Iqbal told him that he (Iqbal) thought that the Pakistan plan would be disastrous to the British Government, disastrous to the Hindu community. "But I am the President of the Muslim League and therefore it is my duty to support it," (quoted from an article by Mahadev Desai). Coming down to the present day, we shall see that Sir Sikandar, a stalwart of the Muslim League does not favour the idea of Pakistan. He has a Party within the League which also does not support it. Sir Nazimuddin, Mr. Suhrawardy and many other League leaders are silent over it. The ever talkative Mr. Fazlul Huq uttered a few words in its support ; but there is no warmth and vigour in it as is to be found in his numerous utterances. Excepting a few League leaders all the battalions of the Muslim League are holding sombre silence over it. A few days ago some Muslim Leaguers of U. P. made a tour throughout the province to popularise the scheme, but they got little response from the Muslim public. Then there is whole body of the Azad Muslim Party who boldly set their face against any scheme for the partition of India. The Krishak Proja Party of Bengal and the Congressite Muslims throughout India are ever ready to fight against the horrible scheme of Mr.

Jinnah. If this is the attitude of the Indian Muslims towards the Pakistan scheme—then what is the necessity of raising the question again and again? Because it has a temporary value. It is intended to wean away the Muslims from all political activities of the country, by raising in their heart a hope for a new Muslim State where they will be the rulers.

It has been said that demand of Pakistan has been raised only to solve the minority problem for ever. But Pakistan will not solve the problem ; it will rather aggravate it. The minority problem of India is not a problem at all, it is a device to withhold from us the granting of our legitimate political rights. As long as there will be struggle for political power, so long will there be the minority problem in India in its crudest and most complicated form. Give India Freedom, you will find that all problems regarding the minorities have been solved. What England wants for us, as condition precedent to grant power to us is unanimity of opinion among the different communities of India. Cutting at the root of all those elements that unify and consolidate the conflicting claims and ideals of different communities, you want unanimity from us. But that is impossible. Remove the separate electorate, do not give the minorities the least hint that you will support their anti-national claims then only you can demand unanimity from us. Otherwise you have no right to ask unanimity from us. Unanimity in all matters is not possible. Is there any such unanimity even in England? Would you then deny freedom to England? We do not understand why our rulers are so much solicitous about the Muslim minorities. But let all the world know that the Indian Muslims are not minority, as the term is understood in European politics. Excepting these differences in religious creed, there is nothing that can distinguish a Hindu from a Muslim. In all other matters both

have the same and identical stake in India. Besides in four provinces the Muslims are the majority. Just as there is every probability of Muslims remaining under the Muslims in several provinces, why should we then demand a division of India when friendship and co-operation are not out of all possibilities. It seems an inexplicable enigma is working behind all these events that have just preceded the demand of Pakistan. If we remember all these events aright—the acceptance of office by the Congress, non-inclusion of the Muslim Leaguers in the Congress Ministries, ceaseless agitation against the Congress regime, the demand of the royal commission—the observance of the deliverance day—the wild ravings of Mr. Jinnah at the Congress leaders —then we may easily find out the genesis of Pakistan. If Mr. Jinnah were given a hand in forming Ministry, we should never have heard about Pakistan and other schemes for the division of India. The entire scheme from top to bottom is a deliberate and calculated device to perpetuate India's slavery and therefore it should be given just the treatment as it deserves. That which was born out of revenge and jealousy should be given timely burial at the earliest opportunity. Let Pakistan be dead past all resurrection and let India remain united and consolidated under one ideal, one banner, and one State.

MUSLIMS IN UNITED INDIA

Considering the various problems—social, religious, political, economical, communal and cultural,—that divide one set of people of India from another, one may say with a certain amount of hesitation that up till now India has not yet developed into a full-fledged nation. But to say that because of these differences India can never be welded into a nation is a statement that can be supported neither from the experiences of the past history of India nor from the development of political thought in India. If unity of religion and identity of race and culture, and language be the sole criterion of nationalism, then there cannot be a single country in the whole world which can be called a nation. In the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th centuries when different people from different parts of Europe came to England and ruled over her, England was not a nation. The Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Danes, Norwegians and Normans were successively the rulers of England. And out of this heterogeneous admixture of diverse races and cultures was evolved the English nation. Such were Germany, France, Spain, Italy and Switzerland, and other countries of Europe. At present rivalry between the Protestants and the Catholics is nowhere to be found in Europe, but at one time this rivalry was of such a serious nature that one faction thought it a religious duty to persecute the other in all possible ways, including the burning and flaying of the living human body.

But while this feeling of animosity was running high, England was fast marching towards the ideal of nationalism. Even to-day we find in England separate churches, separate Bible and separate religious schools for the diverse religious

sects of the people. The Catholics do not touch the Bible of the Protestants. Perhaps the readers are aware that the Calcutta University has prescribed Bible for the I.A. and B.A. classes as text-book for English. As the Catholics do not touch the Bible of the Protestants, the authorities of the St. Xavier's College which is a Catholic institution, have compelled the Calcutta University to allow them to teach their own Bible in their I.A. and B.A. classes. If in spite of this difference England can be welded into a full-fledged nation, why should the differences of religions in India be regarded as the impediment to the growth of unadulterated nationalism? Differences there are, of which some will vanish in the course of time, and some will remain permanently, but they will never stand in the way of India's freedom. In the process of evolution our differences in religion and culture will be treated lightly. The instance of China may furnish us with a good lesson. In China will be found all the difficulties that confront the nationalistic movement in India. But China is fast approaching the ideal of nationalism from the last few decades and to-day all the Chinese including Buddhists, Muslims and Christians are united under their leader as one and undivided nation. If China can be a nation, why should India with better civilization and better culture lag behind, passes our comprehension.

Let us now look back to the past history of India. The history of India is not only the story of wars and intrigues between the rival claimants to the throne. It is also the story of a nation in making. Just as nationalism in Europe is the product of evolution, so also the same forces of evolution have been giving impetus to the ideal of nationalism in India from ancient times. When the Aryans settled in India, they found different elements in the land. But they united them under their banner. Then came the

Sakas, the Huns, the Greeks, the Afghans, the Persians, the Parthians ; they also settled in India and became one with the people. Chandra Gupta, Asoka, Samudra Gupta and Harsha were the Emperors of India and under them lived the Indian people. The Muslim conquerors of Ghazni and Ghore found India divided into numerous principalities, but there were certain common links between them, not only in religion, but also in the idea that they all belonged to one people. When the Pathans were firmly established in India, they became one with the people. In the nebulous form there was the idea of the nation. Due to various forces—political, social and spiritual,—an understanding was being established between the Hindus and the Muslims. Religious reformers who preached the unity of all religions were greatly instrumental in bringing the two communities closer to each other. This process of unification was further accelerated under the beneficent rule of the Moghals.

India would long have welded into one nation, but for the intervention of the European powers who made it their point to rule India by the "*divide and rule*" policy. Much of the communal acrimonies that we witness to-day are the creation of the European powers. Unless India is freed from that influence the problem of nationalism will not be solved. Take away that influence, and you will find India a full-fledged nation. Thus the plea that religious differences prevent India from being united into one nation cannot stand the test of historical analysis. Almost all the religions of the world are proselytizing. If a person of a religious fraternity changes his old religion and accepts a new religion, he does not by that act cease to belong to the nation of which he is a component part, nor does he cut himself off from his original motherland. The English Muslims, the Chinese Muslims, the Arab Muslims, are Muslims no doubt ; but they do not belong to one country,

nor to one people. Similarity of religion does not make them one people. Why should then the Muslims of India have a different status from that of the rest of the people? They are of India and India alone.

If you insist that the Muslims of India, are a separate people, then you will have to recognise the claims of the Parsis, Christians, Sikhs, Buddhists and other communities as separate people and thus cut at the root of all the noble ideals of nationalism. That alone will not do. They may claim separate provinces for them where they will be the sole masters. If India is divided in this way, then there will be no cohesion between the different units with the result that India will permanently remain tied to the chariot wheel of British imperialism. The Muslims of the near Eastern countries never think themselves separate and distinct from the rest of the people of their country. Why have the Arab Muslims made common cause with the Arab Christians in the fight against European aggression? Why are thousands and thousands of Arab Christians rallying round the banner of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem forsaking the cause of the Christian powers of Europe? Because they love their country more than their lives and properties. The national ideal is running in through their vein. Religious differences do not pollute their patriotic fervour. We do not know why some of our leaders are thinking of a separate Muslim nation. Whatever be their motives, that idea will never be realized into action. But if India is divided into several parts, such as Hindu India, Muslim India, Christian India, etc., then not only the solidarity of India will be destroyed, but also the security, peace and prosperity of each part will be at an end. Rivalry, jealousy and constant civil war will weaken the strength of each part and taking advantage of this weakness, the nearest foreign power will devour each part as happened in the past.

Hence the best course is to build a united India out of all the elements that exist in India to-day. In that united India Hindus, Muslims, Christians, etc., will be an integral part ; none will dominate over the other, as none will be independent of the others. The Muslims in other lands did the same thing. The Egyptian Muslims, the Arab Muslims, the Persian Muslims have followed the same course. It is the imperative duty of the Indian Muslims to give up this separatist mentality. If India becomes free, they will enjoy the fruits of liberty along with the Hindus. But if they insist on separate treatment, and get it, others will be jealous of them and in the end they will be ostracised like the Jews. In their own home they will be looked down upon as strangers—a position which is in no way enviable to the Muslims. They will labour under a sort of inferiority complex if they persist in this separate treatment. Hence the Muslims must give up their separatist mentality and join hands with the Hindus and other people of the land to secure freedom for India. A free and united India will ensure better security, and better facility to them than they may expect to get from the visionary schemes of Dr. Latif or Mr. Jinnah. The United India that we want to create will be a power and a force which will put a stop to all sorts of exploitations. The whole world would bend down before her in respect and veneration. The position of the Muslims in such an India will be enhanced thousand times, compared to which their present miserable plight is nothing but a veritable hell. Will the Muslims prefer this hell to the blissful abode that awaits them in a United and free India?

IMMEDIATE MOTIVE OF PAKISTAN

Mr. Jinnah's scheme of partition has spread like wild fire throughout the country. Those who were thinking of making an alliance with the Moslim League have been thoroughly disillusioned by this scheme. It is not only a challenge to democracy or nationalism, but is also a calculated device to bind India to the chariot-wheel of imperialism. The scheme has done one thing in this that it has unmasked the true motives of the communalist leaders. It has shown to the world that the clamour for Moslim interests, Moslim solidarity and protection of the Moslim minorities are nothing but random talks. Behind all these clamours and uproars there is another motive which is to perpetuate the foreign domination over India. And there is no wonder that the scheme will be supported by these communalist leaders only to delude the Moslim masses by presenting before them the prospect of a Moslim hegemony in India. At this critical hour when the whole country is thinking of fresh struggle for independence, the henchmen of British imperialism become nervous as to their own position in the country. The din and bustle of the coming struggle might undermine all their ill-gotten influences. Therefore just in time, came the Pakistan scheme which it was expected would alienate the Moslims and a section of the Hindus from the struggle, and thus divide the energies of the people into diverse directions. Thus the scheme has its obvious objects but for which it would not have seen the light of the day at this late hour. I shall relate one by one what are its immediate objects.

i. *To frustrate the Congress demand of the Constitutional Assembly.* When the Congress demand

Assembly, the League leaders put up a stout opposition to it. But with the passage of time the people began to realise its implications and its bearing on the future constitution of the country. It is certain that the British Government will turn a deaf ear to the demand of Constituent Assembly. But if this demand become persistent and all the people rise in one voice to demand the summoning of Constituent Assembly, the position of the Government will be critical. Therefore some people and party in India must come out to oppose it. Thus the ever obliging Moslim League relieved the Government of their anxiety. No sane Moslim can object to the principles of Constituent Assembly specially when the Congress agreed to grant the principle of separate electorate to the Moslims. But the Moslim League in the interest of British imperialism refused to have anything to do with it. And it is not safe to oppose it when the Congress has agreed to accept all their demands. Therefore the entire energy of the Moslims must be directed to some other alluring objects which might serve the purpose for the time. And what thing is more tempting to the Moslims than the prospect of the establishment of a Moslim-raj in India? Down with Constituent Assembly! Down with united India! Of what value is such an India to a Moslim, if a separate Moslim State is possible. No one did ever ponder over the possibility of such a Communal State. But the mere name of a Moslim State has a charm and that charm has obsessed the Moslim mind. Thus the immediate object of the Moslim League has been fulfilled by this scheme of Pakistan.

2. To spread Communism to the Frontier Province.
 In the eye of the Moslim League the Frontier Province is a Kufaristan, because it is under the influence of the Congress. How to make it an Islamistan? In the past they had made many attempts to convert this province into a League

Gandhiji's oft-repeated declaration that without Hindu-Moslim unity there can be no Swaraj, has encouraged the Leaguewallahs and the scheme has been declared just at the time when the talk of starting a struggle was on the air. The Congress may be terrified, Gandhiji may delay or postpone the struggle,—thus the scheme might have its desired object in frustrating the activities of the Congress.

4. *To wound the non-Moslim feeling.* For the last few years it has been the persistent policy of the Moslim League not only to attack the Congress but also to take every means to rouse the feelings of the non-Moslims. This scheme will do it in more ways than one. The Communal Award, the story of Moslim oppression in the Congress provinces, the agitation against Bande Mataram, Vidya Mandir—these and hundred other devices of the Moslim League have roused the feelings of the non-Moslims. And through a tactful handling of the entire situation the Congress has been able to soften the feelings of people without succumbing to the threats of the Hindu Mahasabha. But if the Hindu feeling is not roused, neither the purposes of imperialism nor of communalism will be served in any way. Hence something must be done to rouse the entire Hindu feeling against the Moslim community, the Pakistan scheme has come out to serve that purpose. As regards other demands of the Moslim League there are thousands of Hindus who are ever ready to accept them *in toto*. But this scheme is of different nature. How could an Indian sign the death warrant of his own motherland? Taking advantage of this scheme, the communalist Hindus might rouse anti-Moslim feeling in their own community. The scheme may be regarded as an opportune device to counteract all national activities without taking recourse to any repressive policy.

5. Lastly the scheme has another immediate object in view. It is to provide the higher British authority

plea to delay and deny and postpone the demand of freedom that has been made by the Congress on behalf of Indian people. Who has emboldened Mr. Amery to refer again and again to the communal problem of India? In his latest speech in the Parliament he has again stressed on the need of Hindu-Moslim unity. It is Mr. Jinnah and his Moslim League that have given the British authorities the oft-repeated plea to trample down all the demands of the people. Mr. Jinnah has humiliated the position of India before the world by inventing such a fantastic scheme which will never come into being. It will do its worst, but will never advance the constitutional problem of India, nor of Islam. No one now thinks of the possibility of the scheme. Is it possible to partition India in the way suggested by Mr. Jinnah? Will the fate of India depend upon the whim of a handful of armchair politicians and will her whole history of 700 years be ignored and will India be vivisected according to the whims of Mr. Jinnah? No, that will never be possible. Not to speak of others, even many of the League leaders do not like it. But what of that? Why should not the agitation over the problem of partition go on for ever and thus embitter the feeling of different community? The agitation may not cease, the Pakistan day may be observed in every village of India. But that will only help the cause of imperialism in the name of Moslim interests. If the Moslims have eyes to see and mind to think and heart to feel, they would never support this fanatastic scheme, rather will exercise all their influence to condemn it as anti-national and anti-Islamic.

INDIA IS OUR HOME

We do not claim that the Pathan or the Moghal rule in India was of an unmixed blessing for the people. There was misrule, and misgovernment, disorder and anarchy. Oppression and tyranny was not an event of rare occurrence in those days. But in spite of all these unfortunate events, the Pathan and the Moghal rule was a national government ; not less national than that of the Tudors and Stuarts of England. It is a paradox in history that the more tyrannical the government, the more readily and willingly did people unite together, compromise their differences and then make common cause against their rulers either to wrest power from them or to rectify them. And the result was that either the rulers were deposed or were forced to grant concession to the people. This sort of tyranny hastened in an indirect way the process of the unification of the nation. The same thing, though in a slow degree, did happen in India. Under the most tyrannical rule of some of the Pathans and the Moghals, the people groaned and suffered immensely, no doubt ; but when they felt that a common catastrophe was awaiting them, they did not hesitate to rise in rebellion against the rulers. This rebellion was greatly helpful in uniting the people, the Hindus and the Moslims, under one flag for one common purpose.

From the long account of Moslim rule in India several important things might be proved which will serve as an answer to those who deny that India is our motherland. Moslim rule in India though oppressive to a certain extent was not an alien rule. Elements of national government were perceptible there. The idea of a national government was gradually taking a definite shape. In due course of time the whole of India would have been united under one central

rule. But the progress of unification was stayed on account of the entry of the European Powers into Indian politics. The Moslim rulers cut off all connections with the outside Moslim world, and even if they conquered the lands beyond the Hindukush, they brought them under the rule of Delhi. Even the question of Khilafat was not their chief concern. They owned little allegiance to the Khalifas of Islam. The Moslim rulers of India did never conceive the idea of a universal Moslim Kingdom over the world. Pan-Islamism was not their rule of life. There were many insurrections in the land led by the Hindus, and some of which were successful. But no ruler did ever conceive the idea of territorial partition of the country on religious basis. The communal problem that is now disturbing the peace of the land was unknown in those days. Later on, when the central power was shaken to the core, and independent Hindu States and Moslim States sprang up in the land, many Moslims lived in Hindu States and many Hindus lived in Moslim States ; and they all lived in perfect peace, amity and friendship. No Moslim did ever think that India was not their homeland. They resisted all foreign attacks upon their country with their life and property, even though they had to fight against their own co-religionists. With the advent of the Europeans in India everything turned topsy-turvy. Thence forward began a new chapter in the history of India. We then began to think that we were separate and distinct from the people of the land. Moslim personal law and Hindu personal law were in the process of melting into one. Fusion of Hindu-Moslim culture was in full progress. Interchange of customs and religious rites was leading the way to national unification. In many cases the Moslims followed the Hindu law without violating the spirit of Islamic principles. Similarly Hindus were adopting Moslim ideals without adopting Islam as their religion.

From their dress, habits of life, dialogue and other unifying elements the communal labels were gradually vanishing. So much so, that it became difficult to a foreigner to distinguish a Hindu from a Moslim. But the 'divide and rule policy' of the European Power stayed the process of amalgamation, which ultimately separated one from the other. Our eyes are no longer fixed upon India ; we now turn towards Arabia, Persia, Turkey, etc., for our safety. This sort of Pan-Islamism has poisoned our mind, and has made us hostile towards India, her culture and civilization.

If our ancestors regarded India as their homeland, why should we not regard it as our own country. The stalwart Moslim Leaguers proclaim from the house-tops that the Moslims were then the rulers of the land ; but now they are slaves. Moslims should always remain free and be the rulers of the land. It is for this reason that they look towards the outside Moslim world with the hope that a day might come when they would establish Moslim rule over India. They do not say these things in plain words ; but these are the inevitable conclusions of those vague and circumlocutory words that they use as to their relation to India. Let us now see how far these hopes are realisable.

Moslim jurists have divided the world into three parts : (1) 'Dar-ul Islam,' (the Moslim State), (2) 'Dar-ul-Harb' (the State at war or the State of the enemies), (3) 'Darul-Aman' (the State of peace or friendly State). They regard the present-day India as Dar-ul-Harb or the land of the enemies and according to them no Moslim is satisfied until this land is converted into 'Dar-ul-Islam.' Those jurists who divided the world in this way had little knowledge that a day might come when the political ideology of their days would be thoroughly and radically changed ; when the Moslims would have to live in a country where the Moslim rule can never be established and the ruling Moslim chief,

would be reduced to fourth-rate powers, so as not to be able to do anything towards the wrongs done to the Moslems throughout the world. The old conception of the Moslem jurist must be changed. The Government of a country on that basis is no longer the order of the day. To-day various problems have cropped up for the solution of which new methods should be adopted. It is foolish to expect that a Moslem rule will be established anywhere in India. The ideal of citizenship is different what it was thousand years ago. Moslems and Non-Moslems should now unite together to form themselves into a single nation. Wherever they happened to live they should establish a National Government. To the history of the evolution of the idea of State, the Islamic conception might be a great contribution, it might be historically interesting, but is now out of date and outside the pale of practical politics. We must have to imbibe new ideas in us, and evolve a new order of State quite in consonance with the spirit of the age.

Why should we regard India as a foreign country? For more than seven hundred years we have been living in this country. We have made it our hearth and home. We have long cut off our connection with the outside Moslem world. The belief that Moslems of the world are of one nation, is only a fiction, an imaginary ideal which was never realised in practice, and will never be done so. Moslems outside India disown us as their kith and kin, they hate us as foreigners, they neglect us because of our slavery, and if they are placed in power, they will subjugate us, humiliate us like foreign conqueror. Why should we then allow ourselves to be subjugated by a foreign Power on the ground that that power is a Moslem Power. Therefore our position in India is just the same as it is with the Hindus of the land. We belong to India, and we are one nation with the people of the land. We will never allow India to be partitioned into

numerous groups and thus destroy the national solidarity of India.

UNITED INDIA

Of late a tendency has developed in the mind of some of the prominent leaders of thought that India is not a nation and cannot be nation ; India is not even a country. It is a land composed of many nations, races and tribes. It is more a continent than a country.

If this fact is true, then it might be said that the attempts of those who want to make India a nation will be futile. Then we shall have to forget the past history of India which tells a different tale. In the past, India was always considered as a single country and its various people were considered as one nation, though they differed from each other in race and religion. India has a past history, —glorious and palmy past history, which is the creation of the entire people of the land. Some have contributed more and some less, but there is the contribution of every people that inhabited the land of India. The present tension of feeling between different communities can not falsify the facts of history, cannot unmake the experiences of history that we have inherited from the past generation. We admit that due to various untoward circumstances over which we have no control, signs of disruptive tendencies are in the air. Communal fury, hatred and jealousy are doing havoc in the country. Fellow-feeling is lost. Friendliness and co-operative outlook has been narrowed down. And considering these narrow tendencies as the permanent phases of Indian life, some of our leaders began to declare that India is not a nation. We do not know what the course of events would lead us to. But if this tendency grows stronger, then there will be an end of all peace and happiness in the country.

We admit that there are differences of language and religion and even of race in India. But nowhere in the world's history these differences have stood in the way of uniting the people of a country into a nation. If unity of race, religion and language is the only standard of a nation, then most of the civilized countries of the world would cease to be a nation. In America there are various languages, races and religions. It is said that a candidate for the Presidentship of U.S.A. has to address meetings in as many as seventy languages and has to approach the people of different races and religions.

In Soviet Russia there are nearly about two hundred languages. As regards religion and race, it might be said without any fear of contradiction that in no part of the world will be found so many races and religions as in Russia. Besides Moslems, Christians and Jews, there will be found other sects whose religious ideas and principles differ fundamentally from each other.

But as the entire country is guided by one political and economic principle, the people inspite of their differences in religion, race or language have formed into one undivided nation. There are more Russians than Moslems, Christians, and Jews etc. The case of India is thousand times better than America and Russia. Here you will find a sort of homogeneous culture that has stood the severest test of time. A spirit of toleration has been moulding the minds of the people from eternity.

Hence persecution for religious opinion has been rarely attempted in India. For centuries Hindus, Moslems and races of other religious persuasion are living in India in peace and amity—a phenomenon which is rarely to be found in the history of the world. At first the Aryans were foreigners, but they became Indians in body and soul. The Moslims were foreigners but they too became completely one

with the land and the people. Hindus and Moslems have been dwelling in India for several centuries.

Then there was no communal quarrel, no communal discord. Rather the great Indian nation was harmoniously evolving out of a mass of heterogenous elements. In some parts of India, Hindus were the rulers where innumerable Moslem subjects lived in peace and happiness and in others there were Moslem rulers with as many numbers of Hindu subjects. If there was any revolt against a ruler, it scarcely took a communal character. Under Hindu patriots Moslem soldiers fought against a Hindu despot. Isa Khan had as many Hindu followers as he had Moslim supporters. Under the banner of Sitaram and Pratapaditya, many Moslims flocked and fought against the Moslim tyrants.

Our personal laws were different no doubt, but even that part of our culture was gradually mingling into one, with the result that many of our social customs became almost identical. Hindus imitated Moslem customs and Moslems freely imitated Hindu customs without any moral scruple.

It is for this reason that we find many Hindu customs regarding marriage, inheritance etc. still linger among the Moslems. In our idea of life, in our daily behaviour, in our endearing talks, in our village ballads and songs, we find how wonderfully the Indian Hindus and Moslems were coming to each other by a natural attraction of love and fellow-feeling. Prince Dara Sikoh has once said, 'Islam and Hinduism are galloping each other towards same goal.' Fusion of Hindu and Moslem culture began in India and it will be complete in India inspite of the many disruptive tendencies that we find to-day. The real fact that an attempt is being made to divide the people of India into watertight compartments shows that throughout the country, there is a widespread feeling of enmity.

harmony and unity among the people. In this process of evolution there should be no violence. It should be complete and a prolonged effort with the help of the wisdom and example of the wise men and lovers of India. There should be no conflict or friction which are now apparent in the world. We should be guided by the noble principle of tolerance.

In other words, there should be love and in this non-violent there should be love. As far as our approach to the Indian problem is concerned, it is to approach the history of India in this way. We should irresistibly let in the modern era India is a part of the Indians of all castes belong to one people bound by feelings of love and sympathy and an atmosphere of glorious nation. Disintegration is not the aim of India nor of Indian. Today as yesterday the same elements have been at the helm. They have attempted to do so from ancient times. The ruler of India, Mr. Bhagat Singh of Punjab India or Mr. Jinnah of British India or even all the people of India pride in her as their own motherland and strive every day to protect her honour and dignity and honour. In India there will be no communalism. There will be no provincialism. All will be guided by the feelings of love, sacrifice and sympathy.

POSITION OF THE MUSLIMS IN INDIA

The position and status of the Muslims in India is a matter of great controversy. Is India our home? Should we mix up with the non-Muslims so as to form one solid nation?—Or should we keep apart and live separately from the rest of the people and form ourselves into a separate and distinct nation by making an alliance with the Muslims of the other countries beyond India? These questions naturally arise in our mind whenever we consider the attitude of the Muslims towards various problems, social, political, economic and educational. Over such serious questions, unanimity of opinion is impossible. Broadly speaking there are two schools of thought among the Muslims, who hold divergent opinions about these questions. One school of thought holds the view that India is not our motherland, rather she is our step-mother, as such we are a separate nation; we should wait for the realisation of the Islamic theocratic ideal of establishing Muslim hegemony over the world with Mecca as its centre. The other school holds the view that India should be regarded as our motherland, just as the Hindus regard her; we are not a separate nation, we are Indians first and should always remain Indian. The latter school has discarded the theocratic ideals of Islam and they want to bind up their lot with the people of the land and thus become bone of the bone and flesh of the flesh of India.

When the Islamic Commonwealth was first established at Medina by the Prophet of Islam, he never intended that it should be an imperialistic power conquering and subjugating the whole world under the sway of Islam with its central seat at Medina. Such an idea was a latter-day notion

the land and were ultimately successful in converting them to Islam. In those countries a sort of national government was thus established. Therefore the original people of the land were not treated as aliens. The Muslims and the original inhabitants of those lands were combined into a single nation. Let us now turn to the countries lying on the eastern side of Arabia. When the people of Bokhara, Persia, Afghanistan and other neighbouring countries, became converted to Islam they did not link themselves to the chariot wheel of Arab imperialism. Each of the countries established a separate government. Though Muslim in religion, they were a separate nation from that of Arabia. The government of those places was a purely national government. No Dr. Iqbal did ever appear there to sing of "Chino Arab Hamara." Just as in Europe one Christian nation fought against another Christian nation for the cause of the nation and the country, so also each of these Muslim states fought against the other for the same reason. Extra-territorial patriotism did not hoodwink them to overlook the cause of the nation and the country.

At first the Muslim occupation of India was that of a military nature. From Bin Qasim to Mohammad Ghori, conquerors after conquerors came and invaded the country. They pillaged and plundered the land and with immense booty went away. It was only after the assumption of sovereignty of Delhi by Kutubuddin that a sort of national government was established over Northern India. Indeed, it was not a full-fledged national government; because the idea that the Muslims were the rulers and the Hindus were the governed, was present in the mind of both the ruler and the ruled. The Hindus thought that the Muslims were aliens, and the Muslims treated them as their subjects. Gradually either by conversion or by immigration, the number of the Muslims increased and with the passage of time

the Muslims became settled in India. The Muslims of Spain remained aloof from the people of the land just as the Romans did in England. But in India, the Muslims began to co-operate with the Hindus and even intermarriages took place between them. When the rulers became oppressive, the Hindus and the Muslims were combined together to overthrow them and place a better man on the throne. I do not deny that in many cases the Muslim rulers were oppressive. But whatever might be the nature of the government, the idea of a national government was gradually gaining ground and the Hindus were taken into confidence in state affairs. Many prize posts under the government were entrusted to the Hindus. It was Muslim rule in form and substance ; but consciously or unconsciously some idea of national feeling was working in the mind of both the Hindus and the Muslims. The Muslim rulers had by this time cut off all connection with the outside Muslim world. Thus cut off from the outside Muslims—the Muslim inhabitants of India adopted India as their motherland. Many of the rulers were despotic, arbitrary, oppressive and whimsical, but their oppression was not confined to the Hindus alone ; they did not spare the Muslims. Sometimes the oppressed Hindus made common cause with the oppressed Muslims and revolted against the Central authority and established independent principalities. It is strange to find that these insurrections and rebellions were not conducted on communal lines. During the troubles and insecure times of the Tughlak Kings, province after province began to throw off the Delhi yoke. Sometimes the Muslims established independent rule with Hindu assistance and oftener than not the Hindu princes founded independent principalities with Muslim help. These facts may be cited to show that the conception of nationhood was taking shape even during the Pathan period.

the energies and capacities of his being to the highest pitch and directing them to their true ends." Thus a culture has nothing to do with the tenets and principles of religion ; it is not to be qualified by a communal or religious name. It is a particular type of perfection which a man attains through a gradual and slow process of evolution, amalgamation and assimilation. At however distant a past you may put your finger, you will never find a day when this process was not in being. The Greek culture, the Aryan culture, the Egyptian culture, the Roman culture, the Islamic culture—all are the results of the same process of evolution. It must be kept in mind that when we say this, we do not confound religion with culture. At present Europe is a Christian country, but its culture is not Christian culture ; it is European culture, and is the outcome of heathenism, monotheism, polytheism, and the different and varied cultures of Rome, Greece, Aryans and Muslims. The same is the case with the Aryan culture and Islamic culture. When we talk of Hindu culture or Muslim culture, we little imagine that these words are misnomers.

What we call Hindu culture is not the work of the followers of the Vedas and the Upanishads alone ; many other factors have largely contributed to its growth. The Dravidians, the non-Aryan aborigines, the Shakas, the Huns, the Greeks have contributed something to it. The contributions of the Hindus to it are decidedly great inasmuch as the whole structure of the Hindu culture has been tinged with Aryan influence. The word "Hindu" is the most comprehensive in the world. It embraces all who adopts India as their motherland. Therefore in a broad sense Hindu culture includes all that has found a place in India. The sum-total of all these cultures is known by the name of Hindu culture ; it is distinct from the religion of the Vedas and the Upanishads. Islamic culture is not the work of the fol-

owers of the Prophet of Islam ; in it also many other factors such as the Arabs, the Jews, the Persians, the Greeks, the Sabians, all gave something to it—and the sum total of their contribution is known as Islamic culture.

When the Muslims came to India, they brought with them Islam as their religion, not as their culture. Islam as a religion does not admit of reconciliation with other religions, specially with a religion which believes in idolatry. But culture is not religion. The culture that the Muslims brought to India began to be influenced by the existing culture of the country. Then began the struggle for supremacy between the Hindu culture and the Islamic culture. As each was inwardly conscious of its own superiority, the struggle was long and protracted ; the merging of the two into one homogeneous entity was delayed. But however jealously they guarded and protected their culture from being merged into one another, the process of amalgamation and assimilation was in full progress in spite of the wrathful "Fatwas" and "Pantis" of the Moulvis and the Pandits. Hindus might not adopt Islam as their religion and the Muslims might not adopt Hinduism as their religion ; but the two cultures have through the long course of time acted and reacted upon each other. The influence of the one over the other has been imparted through various processes. Consciously or unconsciously one has assimilated something of the other and this process is still going on and will go on until the two are merged into one homogeneous whole. Which will prevail over the other, only God can foresee.

A Hindu who adopts Islam as his religion might not remain a Hindu. Similarly a Muslim who is "Suddhised" might not remain a Muslim ; but if a Hindu adopts the Islamic culture or a Muslim adopts Hindu culture, he does not by that act necessarily ceases to be a Hindu or Muslim. There is nothing in Hindu religion or Islamic religion which

prevents its votaries from imbibing a culture different from that of his own. No one will call an Indian a heretic who without abjuring his faith adopts Western culture in his mode and manner of living. If we examine in this light the so-called differences that are supposed to exist between the Hindus and the Muslims, then I think, the greater part of the communal problem will dwindle into nothing. No Hindu can claim to-day that he is the same Hindu as he was two thousand years ago. Similarly, no Muslim can affirm that he is the same Muslim as he was during the days of Sultan Mahmud. Why is this difference between the Hindu or Muslim of one age and that of the other age? The only answer to this question seems to be this, that the influence of culture has acted and reacted upon each other in a thousand ways beyond the control of any fanatically-minded bigot.

A Hindu is generally proud of the Aryan culture, because there is in it the preponderating influence of the Hindu religion. Similarly a Muslim is proud of the Islamic culture, because it has been largely influenced by Islam. But no one can deny that both the cultures are the outcome of various factors. In the Hindu culture of to-day there is something of Islamic influence, and the Muslim culture of India has greatly been influenced by the Hindu culture. To preserve the purity of our culture we cannot go back to the old days by abandoning the teachings of experience that have been imbibed in our culture. Prudence and wisdom demands that we should accept facts as fact and not as an illusion.

The cry of separation is daily being dinned into our ears ; but has that in any way influenced the inner life of the people? In spite of our differences in religion, there will be found a sort of harmony between us undercurrents which are yet to be perceptible by a casual eye. Look to the people,

irrespective of rich or poor, their mode of life, their dress, their dialogue, their conversation, their endearing words. You will marvel to see how the process of the blending of two cultures is at work. Go to a Bengal village and you will find that the two cultures are at the confluence of a great ocean just to be united into one. Dive deep into the daily routine of the village helmets, be acquainted with their tales of joys and sorrows. Search into the simple and unostentatious village ballads, you will find that in spite of certain diversities there is unity, an inner harmony that has been from time immemorial moulding and remoulding the lives of the people. In their habit of life, mode of living, and in sundry other things, are not the Indian Muslims different from those of other countries? A Chinese Muslim is not the same man as an Indian Muslim. In religion they are one, but an Indian Muslim is every inch an Indian, and a Chinese Muslim is Chinese. It is the influence of Aryan culture that has made Indian Muslim so.

I must admit that due to political domination, the process of fusion of the two cultures has stayed for sometime in certain quarters, but not everywhere. The Mahasabmites and the Leaguers might tell their followers to remain true to their old cultures, but they will never be able to revive these in their pristine purity. The very fact that an attempt is being made to revive old cultures shows that the process of fusion is steadily going on. It may be stayed for a short time, but as the time-spirit is in its favour, the work of fusion will go on.

THE REAL PROBLEM FOR MUSLIM MASSES

The expression "minority interests" have now been inseparably linked up with Muslim interests. It is generally believed by our leaders that if adequate protection is given to the minorities, the Muslim community on the whole would be benefited by it. It is on this assumption that a large section of the Muslims has been decoyed into the belief that the Communal Award and other protective measures allied to it have given great impetus to the cause of Islam in India. They refuse to believe that appearances are deceptive. They do not enter deep into the matter relating to the problem of protecting the minorities. A careful observer of the present day political situation in the country will not fail to find out that the minority problem is not the problem of the Muslims, and the problem of the Muslims is not also the problem of the protection of the minorities. The Muslims have the same political and economic problem with the Hindus and others of the land.

Granting of special protection to the Muslims on the ground that they belong to the minority community, necessitates the granting of similar protection to the other communities who are numerically still less than the Muslims. Whenever it was known that the Muslims would be given special facilities, other minority communities would also raise their voice and would begin to demand their special rights and privileges. Why should the Sikhs, the Christians, the Parsis, the Anglo-Indians be deprived of the 'blessings' of special protection? Even the Europeans who do not belong to the people of the soil, and thus have no obligation to the people of India, are demanding the same special facilities as are granted to the Muslims and other

To crown all, came the scheduled castes who demanded special protection on the ground that the caste Hindus are dealing with them intolerably. But the list of the minorities is not complete here.

There are the landlords, the mill-owners, the capitalists. Their plea is that they are the minorities and unless special protection is granted to them, they would be extinct from the face of the land. Thus religious, economic and sectarian problems have been so cleverly jumbled together that there cannot be any logical division of the term "minority." To a careless person special protection to the minorities sounds a simple thing, but in reality, it means many things, and it has many other implications than are dreamed by us. I shall here discuss the matter from the Muslim point of view. If other minority communities except the Muslims do not demand any special protection, then the latter would have been benefited by it to a certain extent. But when the claimants are too many, the Muslim leaders ought to pause for a while and consider about their final gain or loss in all the special facilities that are granted to them. If too many matters are set apart as subjects of protected interests, what would be the ultimate gain of the Muslims? If together with the Muslim interests other minority interests are also protected, and sometimes the interests of the one being opposed to that of the other—what then remains for the Muslims to rely on safely? If you protect the landlords and capitalists then the tenants and labourers will be sufferers among whom there are millions of Muslims. If you give weightage to the Europeans and Anglo-Indians, a certain portion of the facilities should be deducted from the Muslims.

Thus minority protection in the ultimate analysis is not the protection of the Muslim interests ; it is the vivisection of India into various groups, sub-groups and parties so that any coherent action by the combined forces of the people

will not be possible in India. Therefore minority interest does not mean Muslim interest. Minorities are always minorities ; they can never be made majorities. In all democratic institutions, everything will be decided by majority of votes. Under such conditions, where the Muslims are in a hopeless minority, how would they advance their cause against an adverse majority, even if they are granted all the facilities that they demand? Either they must have to find out allies elsewhere or they should make common cause with the majority community of the land. Will it be profitable for them if they rely on the British Government? If the majority party decide to turn a deaf ear to the interests of the Muslims, no special power reserved for the Governor can protect them under any circumstance. It is not possible, nor practical that the Governors would interfere with the day to day activities of the ministers who will command the confidence of the majority party. Nor any amendment of the India Act would reserve everything in the hand of the Governor in the name of minority interests. Excepting a few matters, everything would be left open to be decided by majority of votes. The British authorities would never care whether those matters would affect the minority interests. Therefore ultimately the minorities must have to depend upon the good will of the majorities. But why should the majorities look to the cause of the minorities if the former are not placed under some obligation to the latter? Hence special protection is not the surest safeguard of the minorities. The good will and the friendly gesture of the majorities are the secure safeguard of the minority interests. And that good will and friendly gesture cannot be obtained unless separate electorate is abolished. It is the greatest stumbling block in the way of nationalizing ; it bars all doors of communal settlement. Do away with it and you will find that vital obstacles to national progress will

removed. Under joint electorate the minority interests will be more adequately protected than under separate electorate. You cannot do away with the parliamentary method of forming Government and as long as that method holds good separate electorate is not only an anomaly but positively harmful to the cause of the minorities.

If we study the minority problem of India in detail, we shall find that the Muslim interest is not always and everywhere the minority interest. Though it is a fact that the Muslims are minority in India, yet it is not a fact that they are minority in each province. In four provinces, viz., N.-W. Frontier, Punjab, Sind and Bengal, the Muslims are not in minority, but they form the majority of the population. And in Assam the numerical strength of the Muslims is almost equal to that of the Hindus. If the Muslims claim special protection for them in provinces where they are a minority, they must be prepared to grant the same facilities to minorities in the four provinces mentioned above. If justice and fair-play are the golden rule of guiding the destiny of the nation, the Muslims have no right to claim special protection in those provinces where they are in majority. Instead of reserving anything for them they must grant special facilities to the other minorities which they get in the provinces where they are in minority. In these four provinces the problem of the Muslims is not the minority problem ; it is the general economic and political problem that is the main problem of the Muslims. If complete power is granted to India, the Muslims in these four provinces would get full control over all matters in these provinces just as the Hindus would get over six or seven other provinces. But the pity is that our so-called leaders do not care to understand all these things. They are resisting the introduction of all reforms under the false cry of minority interests. When Mr. Jinnah declined to make a joint demand of in-

dependence with the Congress, he practically resisted the demand of independence of the four provinces too where the Muslims might have got virtual predominance. More the power granted to India, the better it is for the Muslims. Because the Muslim minorities in six or seven provinces are so strong and effective that not a hair of them will be touched. The vast majority of the Muslims in all these provinces belong to the masses. Separate laws can never be made for the Muslim masses and non-Muslim masses. And any grant of constitutional reform would mean the emancipation of the masses. They will enjoy the blessings of freedom. But the evil effect of minority protection has been felt more palpably in Muslim provinces than in Hindu provinces. Here Muslims are to depend more on the non-Indian elements than on the Indian elements. Therefore they cannot do any good work for the masses. But if you abandon special facilities and do not allow others to enjoy them, you will find that the Muslims will not be ultimately losers, but they would reap the greatest advantages out of it. Then the Muslims will be predominant not only in the four provinces, but in others also where they will exercise great influence in moulding the destiny of the nation. Nowhere will there be a communal government,—it would be national through and through.

Too much insistence on Muslim interests has bewildested the vision of many of our Muslim friends. They do not see that by this slogan only the capitalists and vested interests are benefited. At present if the Muslims have any problem, it is how to get rid of their false leaders who are exploiting the entire community under various pretences. If the Muslim community can be delivered from these self-styled leaders, then half the problem of the Muslim masses will be solved at once. It is the senseless dread, talk of fear and fanatical harangue that has made the Moslems a degenerate and effeminate. The moment they will get rid of

these leaders and they will know their true strength, the entire community would be as safe as any other people of the earth. The minority problem in India is not only an artificial thing but it has also done positive harm to the Muslim cause. It has rendered their absolute majority in four provinces practically ineffective ; it has thrown them in other provinces on the mercy of non-Indian elements who may deal with them in any manner they like. The true interests of the Muslim masses depend not on the solution of the so-called communal problem ; it has very little to do with them. It is the national freedom that can give bread and raiment to them, and that is the real problem of the Muslims of India. I call upon all the lovers of Islam to concentrate their whole energy on the solution of that problem alone,—that problem solved, Islam in India is saved for ever from all dangers and apprehensions.

MUSLIM SOLIDARITY

Ever since the new orientation of the Muslim League at Lucknow (1927), the slogan of Muslim solidarity has reached the country from one end to the other. From the lip of every League-leader we now hear that the Muslim are one people, one community, one nation and are in every way distinct from the people following the other faiths. Now the question is, in these days of national up-hill when parties and groups are formed on economic and political basis and ideals, whether or not it is possible and desirable to form party or solidarity on religious and communal basis? The common ground of agreement that exists between one man and another is either religious sentiment or economic interests. If religious sentiment is the ideal upon which a party is to be formed, then what will be the relation of that party to the other party or to the man to the other man, when both profess a different religion? Upon the solution of these questions largely depends the answer as to whether Muslim solidarity is possible and desirable under the conditions prevalent in India. When we talk of Muslim solidarity we must not overlook the other side of the problem that the Hindus might think of Hindu solidarity, the Christians of Christian solidarity and so on and so forth. We should also have to consider the existence of that communal solidarity on the part of the other communities of Muslims.

Many anomalies in the days before the March 1947 followed the partition of the country, when the whole of India's future might settle in religious. All the time the country was governed according to the rules of the British, as prime other religions had no voice in the government.

ministration. In this way there was Catholic solidarity in one country and Protestant solidarity in the other. But very soon many princes found out the fundamental mistakes of that communal solidarity. Trades and commerce were ruined. The resources of many countries were exhausted to avenge the wrongs done to its faith in the other countries. Hence the idea of communal solidarity was abandoned for ever. As a result many Catholic princes entered into friendly treaties with the Protestant princes against the aggression of a powerful Catholic prince. The Protestants did the same thing when they were faced with similar problem. The treaty of Westphalia paved the ground and the French Revolution shattered for ever the idea of religious solidarity and prepared the way for nationalism and national solidarity, each country comprising all its inhabitants irrespective of religion or creed formed one nation and one people. In course of time religious solidarity failed as a policy and principle; on its ashes was established national solidarity which will ultimately lead to international solidarity.

During Muslim rule in India there was no such thing as Muslim solidarity. I do not deny that many rulers were oppressive to the Hindus, but no Muslim ruler followed the principle of "*Cujus regio ejus religio.*" Many Muslim rulers fought against their Muslim rivals with the help of the Hindus. Similarly, many Hindus fought against the Muslims and Hindus with the help of the Muslims. The idea of Muslim solidarity was neither the slogan nor the basis of the campaign of conquest that the Muslim rulers led in India.

Muslim solidarity is a very handy and easy slogan to capture the imagination of the unwary public who think that this cry might bring back the lost kingdom to the Muslims. If our leaders imagine that it would establish a "Muslim

"Raj" again in India, then we must say that they are living in a fool's paradise. When free and independent Muslim countries find it difficult to escape the iron grip of European imperialism, it is foolish to think of establishing "Muslim Raj" in India. From that point of view Muslim solidarity will be a dismal failure. If the motive of Muslim solidarity is to safeguard the rights and interests of the Muslims, then we must declare that such solidarity will never safeguard the interests of the Muslims. Solidarity of a group of people on communal basis is a huge hoax. It does not foster the interest of that community, nor does it advance the general progress of the country. It divides the country into diverse groups and sub-groups and creates no bond of unity among them. Rather, it keeps alive the spirit of mutual rivalry, jealousy and hatred.

It is said that the Muslims are poor and backward in education. But will Muslim solidarity remove their poverty and uplift them educationally? They are poor and backward due to certain general causes which have affected the Hindus and other communities too. The general causes are economic depression and political subjection—these are the main factors for the degeneration of India. Remove these general causes and you will find India marching on the sure path of glory and happiness. How by Muslim solidarity would the League leaders remove the general causes of depression unless we make common causes with the other communities? And why would the other peoples co-operate with us if we insist on Muslim solidarity? And, if we are to co-operate with other peoples why should there be any talk of Muslim solidarity or Hindu solidarity? It is only on the basis of national solidarity that we can build a common platform for the general welfare of the country.

The term "Muslim interests" is a vague term. It is not a fact that the interests of all the Muslims are one and same.

ue to the existing differences in social status, in many cases the interests of one group of Muslims are at variance with the interests of another group of Muslims. There are among the Muslims tenants, landlords, capitalists, and labourers. Are the interests of all these men one and same? Is there not any difference between the interests of Muslim landlords and Muslim tenants? Muslim solidarity can never bridge the gulf that exists between the Muslim capitalists and Muslim labourers. By what miraculous process would our leaders merge the conflicting interests of all these groups of men into one interests? How would they preserve these interests intact and make compromise without offending the interests of the rival group? The tenants want the abolition of landlordism and the landlords want the retention of their rights. How would Muslim solidarity satisfy both these parties? By slogans of "Muslim solidarity" the leaders might retain their leadership for a longer time than is necessary. But when applied to practical politics, it will have disastrous effects on the mentality of the entire Muslim community.

The idea of Muslim solidarity is a relic of mediaeval superstition when it was believed that State policy should be guided according to the dictates of the scriptures. But the rapid growth of the principles of economics and politics has exposed the worthlessness of that policy. It is the considered verdict of history that unless religion is separated from politics, no State in the world can retain its freedom. Muslims throughout the world have suffered terribly for this impolitic principle of Muslim solidarity. The true reason why the Muslim countries could not retain their freedom for long is to be found in their mistaken policy of uniting religion and politics under one head. As long as this idea was rooted in the mind of the Turks, they were puppets in the hands of European imperialism. It is only when the new Turkey

under the leadership of Kemal Ataturk has divorced religion from politics that Turkey became a full-fledged State strong enough to defend herself against any aggression. The other Muslim countries began to follow the example of Kemal. Muslim solidarity is not now the guiding principle of the Muslim countries of the Near East. But the Indian Muslims under the mischievous leadership of the Muslim League are still insisting on this mistaken ideal of Muslim solidarity. It has alienated the Muslims from all progressive movements—it is degenerating the Muslim masses and ultimately strengthening the hands of imperialism.

The sponsors of Muslim solidarity are keen on the point that the Muslim masses be not driven to the socialistic ideals. It is for this reason that they talk glibly of Muslim solidarity. But if this solidarity is achieved it will not help the Muslim masses, they will be exploited in the name of religion, just as medieval Europe was exploited by Papal authority. The interests of the Muslims are not in any way distinct and separate from those of the Hindus and Sikhs and other communities. We do not want Hindu solidarity or Muslim solidarity. It is the national solidarity and the solidarity of the masses that will make India free and save her from Imperial aggression.

ISLAM AND POLITICS

It is claimed by every Moslim that Islam is a democratic religion. Yes, Islam is a full-fledged democracy. It has its well regulated system of ethics, a code of morality, a set of spiritual laws, a rule of guidance for the saviour of distracted humanity. In its eye there is no distinction between a Moslim, and a Moslim, whatever may be his social and economic status. Every Moslim has been enjoined to preach the doctrine of Islam to the non-Moslims so that they may save themselves according to the principles and ideals of Islam. It is for the unprecedented zeal of the Moslims that a large portion of humanity was reclaimed to the fold of Islam. From its very inception the early leaders of Islam laid their whole stress on the ethical and spiritual side of Islam. So it was not difficult for them to set an ideal example of their goodness and nobility which resulted in the conversion of a large number of non-Moslims into Islam. Thus when a large body of men in a definite territory adopted Islam, there grew up a sort of Government which had its basis in the ideals of Islam. Thus was established the first theocratic Commonwealth in the realm of Islam with the Moslims as its constituent elements. As this newly established Commonwealth was meant primarily for the Moslims and composed of Moslim elements only, its rules and policies were bound to be derived from the religious codes of Islam, i.e. the Quran and the Tradition. A secular civil and criminal law and non-moral worldly way of living was beyond the comprehension of the early Moslim leaders. The union of religion and politics having an over-dose of religious instinct in it was the inevitable consequence of following such a policy. And so the early Islamic Commonwealth was nothing but a theocratic constitution. But with the

passage of time a large tract of land came under the sway of Islam where non-Moslims of diverse creeds and nationalities happened to live e.g. Christians, Jews, fire-worshippers and idol-worshippers. Countries like Iran, Syria, Egypt, Afghanistan, Morocco and India were conquered by the early Moslims where diverse religions were living from a long time. Some of these people were converted to Islam no doubt, but most of them retained their old religion. To the first Moslim conquerors and administrators a most pertinent question arose as to how best to govern these non-Moslim elements in countries where Islamic predominance was firmly established. These people refused to be ruled or guided by the Islamic laws. Two courses were left open to the Moslim rulers ; either to force them to accept the Islamic laws or to allow them to retain their own laws, civil and criminal. The Moslim rulers knew it fully well that the Islamic laws were meant for the Moslims only and so consistently with the tolerant spirit of Islam they could not and did not force them to accept the Islamic laws. They knew that it was sinful to interfere in the religions of others, by forcing them to adopt Islamic laws. Hence they did the best possible thing under the existing circumstances. They allowed the non-Moslims to retain their own religions, usages and customs and laws in civil and criminal matters. Thus in the same kingdoms the Moslims were governed according to one set of laws, and the non-Moslims according to a different set of laws. In this way a sort of double Government was established in each country conquered by the Moslims. The theory of "indivisible sovereignty" was thus shattered to the ground. The idea of "one law, one country, one nation" was never conceived by our ancestors. The principle of the same Code of justice for all, the same civil and criminal law for all, the same equality and the same right for all, the same equal share of all in the affairs of the Government,

these sundry other things were unknown to them, or if you object that word "unknown" I would say were not then extant in the Moslim countries. By way of contrast I would like to allude to the principles that Rome had followed in her glorious days. The Roman Republic¹ retained the religions and other non-political rights of the conquered countries, but they never allowed them to retain their own separate laws as against the Roman civil and criminal and other political laws and rights. But the Moslims followed a different course. They had two sorts of laws, one for the Moslims and the other for the non-Moslims. It might be an illustration of their liberality and catholicity. It is for these reasons that they might be termed as benevolent despots, but their method was not an ideal method, because in its very nature there were the germs of disruption. The policy that the Moslim rulers followed could not develop civil laws, could not evolve a homogeneous nation and could never reconcile the non-Moslims even to the most benevolent Moslim rulers. The latter regarded themselves as the conquered people and the conquerors regarded them as an alien one—with the result that the conquered did not miss the first opportunity that they could fortuitously get to revolt against the Moslim rule. Greatest difficulty arose when a Moslim ruler had to administer justice between a Moslim and a non-Moslim. The matter was left to the individual discretion of the judges, and when he was good and just man, perhaps there was then no miscarriage of justice, but when he was a bad man, and there being no rule of guidance, one party had to suffer terribly from the hand of the rulers. This is the inevitable result of allying religion with politics. Religious laws are static, unalterable and unadaptable, while secular laws are moving, alterable, adaptable, and evolving laws. The idea of perfectibility being inherent in religious laws, scarcely was then left any room for their

development. And even if they developed, they did scarcely look to the needs of time. But secular laws are always imperfect, they evolve from age to age and adapt themselves according to the needs of the time. Europe was long converted to Christianity, but her religious laws were always different from her secular laws. It is for this reason that her laws, politics and economics had been marvellously developing from age to age. If Europe had allied religion with politics, she would never have achieved the present eminence. But this could not be possible in Muslim countries where religion and politics were united into a single principle. Each Moslim country had to depend upon the valour and capacity of its rulers. The moment the ruling authority became weak and inefficient, the whole fabric of the state fell to the ground and the country became a prey to rebellion, insurrection, and anarchy till a stronger man assumed the royal power and restored order and peace. The safety and danger, the security and insecurity of each state fluctuated according to the personality of the ruling chief. At last when none was left to assume the royal power, the whole country humbled down before the invading and powerful victor ; and its people became slave. The Moslim countries met the same fate again and again, but they were never prepared to be benefited by the lessons of past experiences. Everything had gone to rack and ruin, but the belief that Islam will be triumphant in the long run still controls the minds of the Moslim to vain and deluding hopes. They are "a dupe of to-morrow, even to-day."

Ransack the history of Egypt, Turkey, India, Arabia and Iran and other countries where Islam was once the ruling power and you will be struck to find the repetition of the same old old story of dynastic feuds, insecurity of state, apathy of the people towards the government and the con-

stantly rebellious tendency of the non-Moslim people under the rule of the Moslim Princes. The Moslim administration, law-givers, and scholars failed to take advantage of the advancing tides of time, they failed to mould and shape their laws according to the requirements of the age when the powers of these countries fell, the inhabitants became slaves under a foreign yoke. What could they do to throw off that yoke when they could not grow the idea of nationality, nor could they develop any conception of political liberty? Let us take the case of India for instance. The unholy alliance of religion and politics proved to be a fatal obstacle to the spontaneous growth of the principle of nationality in India and in other Moslim countries. It is only after the last European war that the evil of this alliance became palpable to some of the countries of the Near East when most of these lands came under the control of European powers. There were Moslims, Christians, Jews and other religious communities in all these countries, but there was no cementing bond between them. During the long period of Moslim rule these people lived apart and sometimes antagonistic to each other. With the advent of Christian powers of Europe, the Christians hailed them as their deliverer and the Jews sighed in relief for a change of the old government. But if these people could have been united under one law and one principle of government, and if religion was abandoned from the policy of the Moslim rulers, then Europe could not get a foot-hold there. The same mistake is being committed by the present day leadership of the Moslims of India. To-day we cannot think of separating religion from politics and for this reason our leaders are harping on the two nations theory and giving their whole weight on the chimerical scheme of Pakistan. What is Pakistan but a most sinister method of perpetuating India's subjection by

again making an attempt to ally religion with politics? It will be better for Indian Moslems if instead of dividing India into Hindu India and Moslim India, they would insist on divorcing religion from the day to day politics of the country.

INDIAN MUSLIMS MISLED

The latest attitude of Mr. Jinnah towards the problem of India's constitutional advancement will, we think, reveal his true character. He could neither give any lead to the Moslems, nor could he shed any light on the present problem of the country. A golden opportunity was given to him to lead his followers to a distinct goal, but he has miserably failed to avail himself of this opportunity. In his impatient endeavour to protect the minorities, he became a willing tool in the hand of the British Imperialism. We do not know how long will the Moslems be a "dupe of to-morrow even to-day," but their present-day attitude shows that they could not get any experience from the history of past few years. Within the last thirty years there has been tremendous revolution in the world in politics, economics, religion, art and literature, but that revolution did not leave the least trace on the mind of the Indian Moslems. To-day they stand on the same place where they stood thirty years ago. Turkey has changed: Iran has changed: Iraq has changed; in the Moslem countries of the Near East, there is ferment and excitement for a new life, a new order of things. They have long given up their Pan-Islamic theory and have accepted nationalism as the only possible way of saving their country from European aggression.

The rise of nationalism always drives away the pest of fanaticism from the land, and the Near Eastern countries

were notorious for their fanaticism, but now liberal minded rationalism has changed the entire outlook of their life. Their cry is not for Islam or Moslem interests, but patriotism has become an article of faith with them. But has the influence of those countries left any mark on Indian Moslems? Have the Indian Moslems changed during the last thirty years? The answer is an emphatic "no"; and who is responsible for this? It is the misplaced leadership that is the true cause of our present degradation and humiliation.

It was in the hey-day of the Swadeshi Movement that the Moslems were called upon to take active part in the struggle for the liberation of the Indian nation. The Swadeshi Movement was for the benefit of the country ; by its complete success, both the Hindus and the Moslems would have been benefited. But the Moslems were weaned away from that Movement by the selfish leaders of the community. While on one side Hindu youths made great sacrifices for the cause of the nation, on the other side allurement and preferment enticed away the Moslem youths from the active field of struggle. Thus the reactionary leaders triumphed over the blooming youth of the Moslem community. Nawab Sir Salimullah of Dacca became the champion of the Government cause, and rallied the Moslem youths under his banner on the pretext that the Moslems were not fit for struggle. The plea that the Hindu majority would devour the Moslems did miracle among the Moslems. And Nawab Salimullah was successful in alienating the sympathy of a large section of the Moslems from the Swadeshi Movement. Practically the Hindu-Moslem problem became keen from that time. But what is the result? The Swadeshi Movement did not fail of its results. It aroused consciousness among the masses ; it sent a thrill throughout the land — and a new race palpitating with a throbbing life arose out of this struggle. But being away from the touch of the

Movement the Moslems were deprived of its beneficial results. National consciousness did not rise among the Moslems. The direct effect of the movement is the speedy rise of industrial enterprises in the land which have economic independence to the people in more ways than one. But from the advantage the Moslems were sadly deprived. Since that day no industrial activity worth the name grew up among the Moslems and why? Because, being habituated to depend upon others, they could not learn the dignity of independent life.

Up to 1920 this was the internal history of the Indian Moslems. There was no mass consciousness among them. It was only during the Khilafat Movement that some sign of life was perceptible. But as that was a religious movement, it could not keep the fire constantly burning. Again came the gloom and darkness as soon as the leadership fell on men like Mr. Jinnah and the Aga Khan. The reactionary elements in the country approached these leaders to make one solid phalanx against the rising tide of nationalism and radicalism in the country. Mr. Jinnah was watching the Non-co-operation Movement from afar with keen insight and it was not difficult for him to detect the vulnerable point through which he could enter the Moslem mind and rally them under his banner against the cause of nationalism. The same religion which was exploited in the Non-co-operation Movement became the ready weapon in the hand of Mr. Jinnah. The same old drama that was enacted during the Swadeshi Movement, was again being enacted on the political arena of India. Throughout the country a false propaganda was launched that Islam is in danger and that the Hindus are out to crush Islam from India. Mr. Jinnah knew what would be the reaction of it on the Moslem mind ; knew that this would enable the authorities to set up a plea for refusing to grant reforms to India. Everything was done in a

lock like regularity as if there was some pre-arranged plan. The Government at once took up the cue from him and they set up the same plea that they took at the R.T.C. i.e., the disunity among the Indians. Thus we see that the history of the Swadeshi Movement was again repeated in 1941.

Trenchant criticism has been made against Mr. Jinnah's attitude. It is needless to refer to it here. Only one thing I would ask the Moslems to consider who is this Mr. Jinnah and what is the Moslem League? I would request them to closely study the history of last thirty years and then form an opinion as to what should be the duty of the Moslems under the present circumstances. You will then find that Mr. Jinnah is nothing but the veritable replica of Sir Salimullah ; the Moslem League is only a semi-official body which supplies materials for mischief to the Government. The Congress has put forward the claim of the nation, but this claim must be resisted. Who is better fitted to do this than Mr. Jinnah, the self-made champion of the minority interests. Why should so much insistence and importance be given to him when there are other men of the same minority communities who denounce Mr. Jinnah as reactionary and the Moslem League as a semi-official organisation?. There are three nationalist Moslem parties, the Ahrars the Shias, the Momins. Among the scheduled Hindus Dr. Ambedkar is not the only responsible person. There are hundreds of men who are more important than he. But why is he given the first preference? Neither the voice of Mr. Jinnah, nor the voice of Dr. Ambedkar is the voice of the whole minority communities of India.

To give undue prominence to these men is to deny freedom to India. It is a plea, and nothing but plea. If the authorities had intended they would have proceeded further, in spite of Mr. Jinnah and Dr. Ambedkar. Is there any

country in the world where there are no differences of opinion? Are there not in England differences of opinion on vital points? Catholics, the Anglicans, the Protestants and various sects are to be found in England? Does the existence of these differences make England unfit for independence which she is enjoying for centuries. Why should then the difference of opinion in India be considered as the ground of India's incompetence? This is the baneful effect of the principle of separatism that has alienated them from the political movement for the last thirty years. Mr. Jinnah might think that he has triumphed, but this is no victory, this is ignominy, humiliation and defeat of the worst kind. Just as in the Swadeshi Movement they became the camp-followers of British Imperialism, even to-day they are doing the same thing in a different garb and a disguised name. In the future history of independent India the names of Abdur Rasul, Leakat Hossain, Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari and hundred other Moslem patriots will be given a glorious place. But Jinnahs and Fuzlul Huqs will occupy negligible places there. Only some passing remarks will be enough for the future students that these men stood as serious obstacles to the freedom of India. The present Moslem leadership should be rejected. A new leadership is necessary and it is only the youth that can come up for that purpose. Let the Moslem youths come out in their thousands and form a Progressive Party and give a true lead to the people of the country, and then the Moslems will be saved.

MINORITIES UNDER DEMOCRACY

Democracy means taking of certain risks. Unless you are prepared to take these risks, you are not entitled to enjoy the full blessings of democracy. No one denies that under democracy there are certain risks, difficulties and disadvantages. But can there be any form of government known to human beings which is free from defects and where perfection can be expected? Among the various forms of government, we shall have to consider only that which is less oppressive, less autocratic, and more humane and more to the liking of the people.

If you compare democracy with the other forms of government, you will find that democracy is far better than autocracy, oligarchy, Fascism, Nazism, despotism and such other forms of government. Compared with the indignities, atrocities, humiliations, oppressions of despotism and oligarchy, the so-called defects and disadvantages of democracy pale into insignificance. Under autocracy a person has no freedom of thought, no freedom of association, no status of a free citizen ; he is like a machine and is bound to act according to the whims and caprices of the machine-man.

But under democracy you have all the advantages of a free man. You have the freedom of thought, the rule of law, the status of a free citizen ; you are not a bondsman, but a worthy co-partner in all the affairs of the administration. There is in it the principle of equality of all in the eye of law. You have full voice in State affairs, however humble be the position you may hold in society. There are in democracy fundamental rights which make your person as sacred as that of a King or the rule of 'Habeas Corpus' which immunites from arrest without trial. There is in the

These are the inestimable blessings of democracy. If it can give you so many advantages, what does it matter if it betrays some defects from which no human institution is immune. Some people may be put to some disadvantages, that is no ground why a larger number of people should be deprived of the innumerable blessings of democracy. No man who has the least particle of patriotism left in him, can decry democracy on the ground that it has certain defects. Democratic countries like America, England, Turkey labour under certain difficulties ; there is also the problem of minority and majority, but the people of those countries do not mind them. Because, they are conscious of the blessings of democracy which are thousand times better and more desirable than certain of its minor defects.

It has been alleged by some of the leaders of the minorities in India that under a full-fledged democracy the position of the minorities will be unsafe and precarious. On numerous occasions those charges against democracy have been refuted by the leaders of the country. They have given pledged assurances and various guarantees of safeguards to the minorities of India. The Karachi Resolution is a Magna Charta of Minority Protection. It may be compared with the declaration of the Rights of Man that was declared to the world on the eve of the French Revolution. If any one is not convinced of any of these guarantees, we would ask : if you condemn democracy, what form of government do you then want ? What is the alternative to democracy ? Will you revert to autocracy. Will you prefer despotism to democracy ? Will you oppose the introduction of democracy and rest content with autocracy ?

Mr. Jinnah does not say this in so many words, but the trend of his thought has drifted towards this that he will prefer autocracy to democracy. But this is absurd ; this is shameful ; this is gross betrayal of the cause of the

country. Reverting to autocracy will not alleviate the misery of the nation ; it will continue the nation in abject slavery. It is only by getting used to democracy, by handling it uninterruptedly, by experiencing it in various ways that a nation can remove its defects and make it as perfect as can be possible by the effort of a human being.

It has been pointed out in various articles again and again that in constitutional history there is no such thing as communal minority. Of course there is political minority, but that is quite a different thing. When there will be declared the fundamental rights, these will be the rule of law, equality of all in the eye of law and such other rights and privileges that guarantee complete individual freedom.

Then, why this fuss about the protection of the minorities? Each individual and each minority shall have full freedom to practise, preach and protect his religion, culture, language etc., in whatever way he likes, provided he does not interfere with the same rights of other people. There will be the court of law where the oppressor will get punishments, the oppressed will get relief. The Judiciary should be independent of the executive and the legislature, and the executive will under all circumstances remain responsible to the legislature for each of their action. If any individual persecutes any minority, they have their remedy in the law court, in the legislature, in the executive. There they will get proper and adequate relief. What is happening in other democratic countries, why should it not happen in India? There is no ground for any deviation in India.

Without considering all these things, Mr. Jinnah hails on the theme that India is unfit for democracy. He does not want that the people of India should be welded into one nation. Rather he wants it live apart and separate "the rest of the people. The Muslims as a different " he says should live in a separate group, and

make common cause with the non-Muslims of India. His insistence on separate electorate, separate communal organisation, and separate interests and privileges of the different religions rests on the false idea of security. He takes the rough estimate of things and believes that the Hindus are a majority community and the Muslims the minority. He totally ignores the economic factors, the sociological factors that run in and through the entire people of India. But he must know that if the majority Hindus have no relation with the minority Muslims, how can the latter expect any good treatment from the former? How can we get our rights and privileges without relying on a third power?

Take away that idea of separatism from our body-politic, place the Hindus and the Muslims and others on the same platform. Make such arrangements so that the Hindus must seek Muslim help and the Muslim seek Hindu help—you will find a miracle within ten years. The thing needful for this is the intention and the strength and toleration of mind to bear up all eventualities. A sense of indivisibility of the people of India and a sense of the sameness of their interests is the proper condition for the successful working of democracy in the country.

But Mr. Jinnah has cut at the root of all these ideals by accepting the "Communal Award" as the proper safeguard for the Muslims. And when he found that under the "Award" the same fruit did not come out as was expected to get from a full-fledged democracy, he began to hurl his curses and invectives against democracy itself. He must know that if the present India Act does not protect the Muslims, the blame does not lie on democracy, because the India Act does not give any democracy to India ; the entire blame lies on him and the Muslim Leaguers who have accepted the "Award" which is the negation of democracy. Repeal the "Award", introduce all the factors of democracy,

then you will find that no minority is tyrannised over, no majority becomes turbulent, and all are placed on perfect equality.

We believe that India is in a fit condition to receive democracy. Toleration is an essential quality of the Indian mind. India knows how to respect the feelings of the minorities. The so-called minority is an artificial minority. There is no minority problem in India. It is an imposture like all impositions ; it is retarding the healthy growth of democracy and nationalism in the land. The so-called minorities will not suffer in the least if full-fledged democracy be introduced in India. In a free and democratic India they will enjoy the same rights and privileges with the majorities and will advance shoulder to shoulder with their fellow countrymen on their onward march to liberty, peace and happiness.

IRAQ—A LESSON FOR INDIAN MUSLIMS

Those of the Muslim Leaguers who are bent upon partitioning India on religious basis should take a lesson from the constitutional history of the Near Eastern Muslim countries where the communal problem was as complicated as it is in India to-day.

At present there are several independent Muslim States which emerged into existence after the last Great War. In these States there are the same problem of race, religion, language, culture and civilisation as are found in India. Rivalry between different religious communities was rampant ; jealousy, quarrel and internecine warfare were things of daily occurrence in these countries. As long as these territories were under the imperial sway of the Turkish Sultans, who in the true spirit of imperial authority ruled these

lands on the basis of 'divide and rule' policy, these internecine quarrels and dissensions were being daily aggravated by the foolish policy of the rulers.

But after the last War came the crash and British Power was shattered to pieces. Each country revolted from her and after great struggle attained freedom and solved its own problem according to the needs of the hour to the entire satisfaction of the people concerned. Freedom achieved, all communal, racial and linguistic and cultural problems were automatically solved. These countries are now enjoying peace and security which they never had during the time when they were under the Sultans.

The nationalist elements in India always insist that too much stress should not be given on the communal problem. It is a result of loss of independence and when independence will be attained all communal problems will be solved in India too. To solve the communal problem first and then to attain freedom is a fantastic idea : freedom should be first attained, then automatically all other minor problems will solve themselves. That is the lesson we can unmistakably get from the history of the Near Eastern Muslim countries.

As an example I shall briefly refer to a chapter from the history of modern Iraq and show how the Iraqis refused to be guided by those obnoxious ideas that are daily being preached by Mr. Jinnah and his satellites. The people of Iraq have totally rejected the ideal of Pan-Islamism and Pakistan and followed a strictly national policy in shaping the destiny of their beloved land.

It is generally believed by the Muslim Leagues that all Muslims living in a particular country belong to one nation and non-Muslims to a different nation. But Iraq has refused to adopt this principle. On the contrary, they believe that the entire people of the land, in spite of their differences in race, religion, language and culture, comprise one and

divided nation. With them these differences are of minor importance. If you live in a well-defined territory and have common economic and political interests you are one nation. So long for a period all the near Eastern countries were guided solely by the ideals of Pan-Islamism and Muslim solidarity. But now they have given up that ideal and have adopted a full-fledged national ideal.

It is not a Muslim League or a Muslim Majlis that frames the constitution of Iraq. It was a Constituent Assembly (as envisaged by Indian National Congress) representing the entire nation that drafted and sanctioned it. There is no provision for separate electorate and special privileges to the minorities in the constitution of Iraq. Although the King of Iraq is a hereditary Muslim Prince, yet the entire framework of the constitution is built on a strictly national basis.

The Iraq Constitution was framed by a Constituent Assembly on July 10, 1924 ; it was confirmed by the King on March 21, 1925, and later amended by the law on July 29, 1925. Some of the important provisions of the articles of constitution are worth noticing. All sorts of communalism were strongly repudiated by the constitution thus:—

(1) There shall be no difference in the rights of Iraqis before the law, whatever differences may exist in language, race and creed.

(2) Iraqis shall be equal in status as regards the enjoyment of their rights and the discharge of their obligations. Government appointments shall be bestowed upon the Iraqis alone, to each one within his capacity and fitness. No person other than Iraqis shall be employed in Government appointments except in special circumstances.

(3) The Regent or the Member of the Council of Regency must be of Iraqi nationality and no person may become a Member of the Senate or Chamber of Deputies who

is not a national of Iraq and who claims foreign nationality or protection.

(4) *Iraqi nation is composed of Arabs, Kurds, Turkmans and other peoples such as the Syrians, Chaldeans and Assyrians. All these elements are now submerged into one entity and that entity is the Iraqi and in this entity the smallest as well as the biggest elements enjoy the full rights of citizenship on equal footing.*

There are various religious sects in Iraq such as Moslems, Christians, Jews, Sabians, Yezidis, Bahais and Magians. Although the Moslems form the majority, yet the non-Moslems do not lay any claim for separate electorate and special privileges and protections. The Mosque stands besides the Church and Synagogue and the voice of the Muazzin mixes with the peal of the church bell and yet there is no street broil over the problem of music before the mosque. *First a Moslem and then an Iraqi that is not the watchword of the Moslems of Iraq. Their watchword is—religion relates to God and nation belongs equally to all.*

Among the numerous religious sects of Iraq none enjoys special privileges and protection. A Moslem, a Christian, a Jew has no privilege distinguishing him from the others. All of them are of one fraternity and brotherhood. There are several languages prevalent in Iraq, each claiming superiority over the other. But for the languages' sake no one ever thinks of going against the best interests of his country. Arabic, Kurdish, Chaldean, Hebrew, Turkish, Armenian—these six languages are generally used throughout Iraq. Of these Arabic is the *lingua franca* of the land. But no quarrel or communal riot takes place for propagating language. All languages are respected.

Within a short space of time the people of Iraq have been welded into a nation. Each people loves his constitution, nation and country dearly. No extra-territorial

patriotism guides their internal and external policy. Deputies and Senators take an oath before their respective Assemblies that they will be loyal to the King, observe the constitution and serve the nation and the country. Is it not a worthy lesson to our Muslim Leaguers who are betraying the cause of the country and the nation at every step that they are taking up?

This is in brief the background of Iraq's constitution. From this it will appear that Iraq is fast developing into a full-fledged nation. I specially commend this example of Iraq to the bewildered Muslims of India so that they may take a lesson from it. While being enamoured of Pan-Islamism and Pakistan, we are adopting a suicidal course. Moslems in other parts of the world are following a different line.

If the Iraqi Moslems had Muslim Leaguers they would long have gone down under heels of some power or other. But thank God, they rejected that course and were thus saved. Let the Indian Moslems reject the ideals for which the Muslim League stands, and they will find that they have done it for their own good and well-being.

SIR SYED AHMAD'S CONCEPTION OF NATIONHOOD

Sir Syed Ahmad's contribution to the cause of nationalism in India is generally minimised, because of his pro-British tendency. It is a fact that he was a great admirer of British method of administration, and he was one of those who believed that the British rule was a boon to India and her people for certain purposes. But the other side of the shield must not be overlooked. The late Moulana Mohammed Ali described him as the "arch-enemy of the British rule in India." The fact is th

never desired that British rule should be perpetual in India, rather he wished that it would continue only so long as it was necessary for the Indians to be imbued with European principles of administration. He hoped that in the meantime Indians would unite together and form themselves into one united and undivided nation. He was a strong supporter of Hindu-Muslim unity. He opposed the Congress not on the pretext that it was a Hindu organization, but on the ground that it was opposed to the British Government—the Government whom he looked upon as necessary evil. He had not the least aversion to the Hindus, but in many of his public utterances he openly advocated the cause of Hindu-Muslim unity. He advises the Muslims that they should unite with the Hindus for the common good of the country. Those of our communalist leaders who always raise the question of Muslim solidarity, Pan-Islamism, extra-territorial patriotism, must bear in mind that the great Syed Ahmad was never enamoured of those high-sounding medieval ideals. He believed that the Indians comprising the different communities must be welded into one nation and one common brotherhood. He was a lover of Britishers, no doubt, but his ulterior motive was to reconcile the Muslims to the country and the Hindus. Unlike our present-day leaders who never miss the least opportunity to rouse the communal feeling among their co-religionists, Syed Ahmad tried his level best to reconcile the Muslims to the Hindus. Hindus and Muslims—he regarded them as the two eyes of the Mother India. He always exhorted them to love each other as brothers of the same family.

A few pregnant words from his speeches will illustrate what was his ideal about Indian nationhood. In one of his memorable speech delivered at a gathering at Gurudaspur (1885) he defined the ideals of Indian Nationalism in this way:—

"From the oldest times the word "Nation" is applied to the inhabitants of one country, though they differ in some peculiarities which are characteristic of their own. Hindu and Muhammedan brethren, do you people any country other than Hindusthan? Do you not inhabit the same land? Are you not burnt and buried in the same soil? Do you not tread the same ground and live upon the same soil? Remember that the words "Hindu" and "Muhammedan", are only meant for religious distinction, otherwise all persons whether Hindu, Muhammedan or Christian, who reside in this country belong to one and the same nation. Then all these different sects can only be described as one nation ; they must each and all unite for the good of the country, which is common to all."

On another occasion he spoke about the same thing at Lahore in this way :—

"In the word Nation I include both Hindus and Muhammedans, because that is the only meaning which I can attach to it. With me it is not so much worth considering what is their religious faith, because we do not see anything of it. What we do see is that we inhabit the same land, are subject to the rule of the same government, the fountains of benefits for all are the same and the pangs of famine also we suffer equally. These are the different grounds upon which I call both these races which inhabit India by one word i.e., HINDU meaning to say that they are inhabitants of Hindusthan. While in Legislative Council I was always anxious for the prosperity of this Nation." ("India Nation Builders"—Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, page 41-42).

It requires some boldness of mind to call the Hindus and the Muslims of India as Hindus. Perhaps the veteran leaders of our day would shudder at this suggestion. But Syed Ahmad boldly told the Muslims that as inhabitants

of Hindusthan they are also to be termed as Hindus, just as a Christian or Jew of Turkey (or Egypt) is nothing but a Turk. Muslims alone are not Turks or Egyptians.

To-day at this distance of time when we are quarrelling about petty things we should remember the noble ideal of Sir Syed Ahmad,—that we are the children of the same Mother India—children in fact and in ideal, and ever shall remain such as long as we shall inhabit India. Pursuing the ideals of Sir Syed Ahmad let us form ourselves into one Nation—one community—one people.

HAIL, MOTHER INDIA

Hail Mother India! Holy of the holiest, beautiful of the beatifullest, sweet of the sweetest, noble of the noblest—Oh thou Mother, thou art the most heavenly land on earth! When thou first arisest out of the unfathomable ocean thou wast invested with glory, and power, beauty and charm, sweetness and loveliness and thy Creator did behold thee with pride and joy. A handimade of God, thou art the most illuminating testimony of the greatness and vastness of the Supreme Being Himself. Thou art the epitome of the Universe—the whole universe in its miniature form being included in thee! Sages and Rishis have chanted thy glory; Poets and Philosophers have been bewitched by thy beauty; warriors and conquerors have been charmed by thy greatness! Thou art the mother of civilization and culture—thou art the inexhaustible spring of inspiration and ideals, joy and beauty, health and plenty! I hail thee, Oh Mother India. How I love thee, feel pride in thy greatness and take shelter in thee in weal and woe. On thy sweet bosom I was born and I shall take my shelter in thee when I shall die! Hail, holy Mother India!

This beautiful land is a special creation of God, the Almighty. In beauty, and sweetness, charm and loveliness it is the most fascinating land on earth. A glorious sun shining sweetly throughout the day over the limitless, spotless azure sky, has added charm to its beauty. A bewitching moon surrounded by myriads of far-flung stars, sheds sweetness and lustre on the land. Sweet breeze, aromatic Zephyr blowing continually throughout the year drives away filth and dirt and gives health and strength to the people. Its healthful and milky rivers spreads fertility and vitality on the land. Its mighty forests, its delicious fruits, its fragrant flowers give joy and happiness to the people. Far away on the northern boundaries there are majestic mountains which raising their proud heads on the sky are protecting the country like faithful sentinels from foreign aggression. Its forest trees are echoed and re-echoed by the sweet songs of the birds. Its mines contain precious pearls. Its cities and towns are throbbing with life and vitality. Its innocent villages are the true fountain-head of energy and contentment. In a word the Creator did not give a better instance of his creative power on earth than this holy land of India.

From ages and ages, India has been a land of civilization and culture, art, literature, Philosophy and Science. From remote antiquity, people of the different countries and lands came to India and found here a hospitable shelter. From the banks of the Danube and Volga, came the white Aryans, then came the Persians, Greeks, Parthians, Shakas, Huns, Aryans, then came the Arabs, Pathans, Mogals, Europeans—and they found in its broad bosom a fit abode for habitation and dwelling. Mother India has nursed all, has served all that came to take her shelter and has made them the bone of her bone and the flesh of her flesh. All that took shelter on her lap,

are irrespective of caste, creed and sect, Indians—the children of Mother India. Hindus, Moslems, Christians, Budhists, Jains and Sikhs—all are the children of the common mother India and all have equal shares and equal rights in her and all are equal in her eyes. No one who loves her is a foreigner or an outsider. We the Indians are all brothers to each other, our sorrows and pleasures, our joys and griefs are all common to each other. For the last several centuries we have been living in India as the children of the soil, and we shall live here as children till eternity. We owe allegiance to no other land than this our mother, we have no hankering after lands other than this our beloved mother land. Which land can we prefer leaving this beautiful land?—This heaven on earth! When the Aryans first came to India, they were outsiders; when the Arabs conquered India, they were foreigners. But they all became the children of the land and now there is no difference between us;—Hindus and Muslims, Christians and Parsis—all are one people and one nation. We are now Indians and nothing but an Indian. We are bound to India like one on a stake and we cannot fly from it. Our destiny is tied up with India's destiny. For good or bad we shall live for India and die for India. India is not the land of the Hindus alone. Nor can the Moslims lay exclusive claim on India. Before the advent of the Hindus the Dravidian, the Koles, Bhils and Santals were the only inmates of India. Then came the Aryans, who with better type of civilization and culture civilized the whole of India and became masters of the land. But they did not annihilate the aborigines, but absorbed them in their broad bosom and made them a part of their own. There grew up a mighty civilization which far outshone the civilization of the other parts of the world. Then came the Moslims who brought a glorious civilization and culture from their own land. They were

at first foreigners, but with the passage of time adopted India as their motherland. They made India their hearth and home. The Muslims were the rulers of India for nearly seven centuries. During these times what was the position of the Muslims in India? Did they rule India like a Roman Province? Did they drain India's wealth and send it to the desert lands of Arabia? No, they did nothing of the kind. They were of the land and for the land, they brought wealth and booty from other lands and enriched India in many ways. They were for all intents and purposes Indians and like Indians they ruled the land for the benefit and betterment of India. The Muslim rule in India might be despotic, autocratic or tyrannical, but it was after all a national Government. Tudor despotism in England was as bad as possible, but it was not a foreign rule over England. In the same way the Muslim rule in India was not a foreign rule. But when the Muslim power was overthrown, a foreign rule was established in India which made us slave in every sense of the term. Our common motherland has been placed under the protection of the foreign power which began to rule us from a country far away from India. Freedom has been denied to India and it is for this reason that India has been fighting for her emancipation for the last fifty years. As India is our common mother land why should any one lags behind in fulfilling his duty towards his mother? The original home of the Muslims might be somewhere in Arabia or Persia or Khorasan. But what have they to do with that? They have long cut off all connections with those countries, just as the Hindus have long cut off all connections with their original home at Central Asia. At present India is the only place where we can reside safely with honour and dignity.

Smoothly and harmoniously we were marching towards

our desired goal and it was expected that in immediate future we shall be moulded into one nation. But a different tone was struck by a section of the Muslims that it is sin for a Muslim to call the place of birth a holy land and mother. If Mecca or Madina may be called holy land with impunity, why should we desist from addressing India as the holy land and motherland? A queer logic indeed! Is it not the same land on whose broad bosom we have been living for the last seven hundred years? Is it not the place for whose freedom our forefathers had shed their blood? Is it not the same land where we are living in peace and amity with the Hindus and other communities? Why should we consider it a foreign land? Why should not our arms be lifted to defend India's freedom? India's greatness is our greatness. Its humiliation is our humiliation. Its freedom is our freedom. We should not leave out of account the attitude of the Muslims of other lands towards their own country. Turkey has shown the way. A predominantly Muslim country, Turkey has refused to ally religion with politics. A full-fledged nationalism has been established in Turkey. From every lip in Egypt is now heard the voice of the nation—"Misr-Lil Misrin"—"Egypt for the Egyptians"! Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan—all are now fighting for national principles. The Indian Muslims ought to take lesson from the recent happenings in the Near Eastern Countries. We should abandon for ever all ideas of extra-territorial patriotism and fix our whole attention on India as the land of our birth and contribute our share to make her free and noble and happy.

I take pride in India in all her past glories and honours. Robed in splendour and dignity let our common mother regain once more her former freedom and majesty. Let India be our motherland in the truest sense of the term. All that grew on its broad bosom

is our inheritance. Its Vedas, its Upanishads, its Rama, Sita, its Ramayana, and Mahabharat, its Krishna and Gita, its Asoka and Akbar, its Kalidas and Amir Khusru, its Aurangzeb and Dara, its Rana Pratap and Sitaram—all are our own inheritance. None of them is alien to us—Muslims,—or alien to our civilization and culture. Whatever is bad in it or whatever is good in it—all belongs to me. Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsis, Sikhs whatever community resides in India are brothers to me. With them I form one undivided nation and with them I fall and with them I rise. My fate has been linked up inseparably with the rest of India. Therefore we the Hindus and Moslims and other communities should stand before our Mother India in love and veneration and show respect to her. Our unhappy mother is in bondage and we should liberate her and make her free, happy and contented. Let us welcome the New India that is coming—the New India that is emerging out of the debris of one hundred and fifty years of foreign domination. Let us all salute our noble Mother India—not southern India and northern India, not Hindu India and Moslim India, but India as a whole, undivided India in its entirety—India the Universal mother of all civilization, and culture. Let us not partition our Motherland India, and cut to pieces the nerve-centre of her very existence. Let her remain one and undivided, and a single whole, so that we may call her children our own brothers, the bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. And there lies our salvation. Let Mother India raise her voice and proclaim her message of peace and freedom to the whole world.

Hail, Mother India, be thou my nourisher and protector against all odds and difficulties. Oh mother! be thou free and noble, strong and perfect, and hug into your bosom this your indulgent child and make me feel your strength

and pride. I yet again salute Mother India in respect and love!

سارے جہاں سے اچھا ہندوستان ہمارا
 ہم بلبلیں ہیں اسکی یہ گلستان ہمارا
 پریت وہ سب سے اونچا ہمسایہ آسمان کا
 وہ سنتری ہمارا وہ پاسبار ہمارا
 یونان و مصر روما سب مت لئے جہاں سے
 اب تک صدر ہے باقی نام و نشان ہمارا
 اقبال*

* "Hindusthan, my country stands supreme to all other countries of the world:

We are the nightingales and she is the garden.

The highest mountain that touches the skirt of the firmament is our sentry, our watchman.

Greece, Rome and Egypt have all been wiped out from the face of the earth ; but we survive even to this day."

—IQBAL

APPENDIX A

DR. LATIF'S SCHEME

MUSLIM LEAGUE PLAN

The Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference presided over by Mr. Mahomed Ali Jinnah passed on October 10, 1938, the following resolution:—

"This Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference considers it absolutely essential in the interests of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interests of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment and political self-determination of the two nations known as Hindus and Muslims, that India may be divided into two Federations viz., the Federation of Muslim States and the Federation of non-Muslim States.

"This Conference, therefore, recommends to the All-India Muslim League to devise a scheme of Constitution under which Muslim majority provinces, Muslim Native States and areas inhabited by a majority of Muslims may attain full independence in the form of a federation of their own with permission to any other Muslim State beyond the Indian frontiers to join the Federation and with such safeguards for non-Muslim minorities as may be conceded to the Muslim minorities in the non-Muslim Federation of India."

If this resolution is ever given effect to, the map of India will have to be redrawn in some such shape as given in the map that finds a place in a booklet entitled—"The Cultural Future of India"—written by Syed Abdul Latif, Ph.D. (London), Professor of English (retired), Osmania University (Hyderabad), Hon. Secretary, Muslim Culture Society (Hyderabad, Deccan) and Vice-President, the Hyderabad Academy. The author asks us—"The idea of a single nationality . . . should be given up altogether". He asks us to believe: "It (single nationality) will not thrive on the Indian soil". The Karachi resolution gives a shape and form to the ideas discussed and supported in the booklet. The Nizam State, a centre of Muslim awakening, is also the hot-house of this idea that divides India. There are other centres, other dreamers of the dreams that Dr. Latif dreams.

THE CULTURAL FUTURE OF INDIA

By SYED ABDUL LATIF

MUSLIM CULTURAL ZONES

1. North-West Block—Taking the case of the Muslims first there is at present a great Muslim block in the North-West consisting of Sind, Baluchistan, the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province and the Indian States of Khairpur and Bahawalpur. This area may be converted into a single autonomous State formed on the basis of federal relationship between the six units thereby allowing over 25 millions of Muslims a free home of their own.

2. North-East Block—Right on the other side of India, the North-East, you have a solid block of Muslims in Eastern Bengal and Assam of over 30 millions, who may be assigned a free political existence.

3. Delhi-Lucknow Block—In between the two above mentioned blocks the Muslims are unevenly distributed. Those of this area living close to each of the two blocks should be attracted for naturalisation to the one nearer to them. The rest, the great bulk belonging at present to the United Provinces and Behar numbering about 12 millions, may be concentrated in a block extending in a line from the Eastern border of Patiala to Lucknow and rounding up Rampur on the way.

4. The Deccan Block—The case of the Muslims below the Vindhya and Satpuras calls for a special consideration. They are scattered all over the South in colonies of varying size and exceed 12 millions in number. For them a zone is to be carved. Such a zone the Dominions of Hyderabad may provide with a strip of territory restored to them in the South, running through the districts of Kurnool, Cuddapah, Chittore, North Arcot and Chingleput down to the city of Madras. Such a strip with an opening to the sea will be found absolutely necessary to settle the large Muslim mercantile and marine community living for ages on the Coromandal and Malabar Coasts.

The formation of this block will be advantageous to everyone concerned and allow the fullest autonomous existence to five distinct Hindu nationalities with exclusive boundaries of their own—the Mahratta, the Canarese, the Malayali, the Tamilian and the

Andhra. The present territory of Hyderabad is linguistically not a unit. Mahratti is the language of the North-Western districts, Canarese of the South-Western and Telugu of the Eastern districts. The Telugu-speaking people of the Dominions may be absorbed by the Andhra Province which should consist of the Northern Circars, Guntur, Nellore and portions of Kurnool, Cuddapah and Chittore and a slice from the Central Provinces. The Mahrattas and the Canara people of the Dominions will be joined to their respective nationalities to the West and South-West. The Muslims of the Peninsula who will concentrate in this Deccan Block will in their turn have restored to them the historic consciousness that they are the common inheritors of the Muslim culture that developed and flourished here for centuries consummating in the time of the Moguls when the whole of this area formed part of a single Suba.

The area assigned to this block may appear to be rather too large for the number of Muslims to accommodate. But there are special factors which are to be taken into consideration. Large portions of the Dominions of Hyderabad are still undeveloped or rather covered by either forests or barren rocky tracts. The Muslims from a vast peninsula are to be gathered here—from Orissa, Central Provinces, the whole of Bombay and the Madras Presidencies, Mysore, Cochin, and Travancore. Most of the Muslims of the areas concerned have shown phenomenal increase in population during the last few decades, and their future expansion is to be kept in view. Moreover, the Muslims of the North-East, and Delhi-Lucknow blocks will be confined to narrow zones. The Deccan Block will provide a settlement for surplus population from these blocks. There is this also not to be lost sight of. The minor communities such as the Christians, the jungle tribes and a vast section of the Harijans innured to the climate may most likely stay on where they are as protected or privileged communities adding thus to the total quota of population that may legitimately be allotted to the area.

Minor Muslim Centres—In suggesting the formation of the above four blocks for the Muslims, the case of those living in Rajputana, Gujerat, Malwa and Western India States, has not been considered. They will need to be concentrated in the territories of the Muslim States of Bhopal, Tonk, Junagadh, Jaora and others, and a newly constituted Free City of Ajmer on the same basis of the exchange of population.

advantage ; for here inhabit three different Hindu races speaking three different languages of their own, viz., Telugu, Canarese and Mahratti. They will now be gathered to their respective main stocks in the adjoining Hindu zones, and enjoy a homogeneous life with their own kind.

SAFEGUARDS UNDER THE PROPOSED FEDERATION

Even after the proposed cultural federation is established, it is possible that individuals belonging to one or other of the several nationalities may have to stay on where they are for various purposes. Such individuals will be afforded security of person and cultural interests under a 'Public Law of Indian Nations' adopted by Central Government. It should be added that all religious shrines, monuments and graveyards belonging to any one of the two nationalities left behind by either will be preserved and looked after by each Free State under the supervision of the Central Government.

INDIAN CHRISTIANS AND OTHERS

The case of the Indian Christians and Anglo-Indians or of the Parsees or Buddhists has not been discussed here, as their problem has not yet assumed any seriousness and may be left to the future for adequate settlement. Till then they should have to be afforded by each Free State proposed, Muslim or Hindu, all the necessary religious or cultural and economic safeguards that they may need to enable them to live an honourable existence as the children of the soil, and citizens of a common mother-land.

The problem of the Harijans stands, however, on a different footing. They are not a small section. They count by millions ; but they are dispersed all over the country and live in every village or town, and form countless racial varieties, and do not possess any common culture between them. They will, therefore, have to be given the fullest freedom to select their own place in either the Hindu nationality or the Muslim, or the Christian ; for, left alone, they will probably take ages to develop a culture of their own.

SIR SIKANDAR HYAT KHAN'S SCHEME

COUNTRY TO BE DEMARCATED INTO SEVEN ZONES

REGIONAL LEGISLATURE FOR EACH ZONE

FEDERAL LEGISLATURE TO BE UNICAMERAL

Lahore, July 29, 1939.

Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan's scheme of Indian Federation, which he has compiled in a book form, is published to-day.

Sir Sikandar Hyat says that he does not claim perfection for his scheme which he says is susceptible of improvement. "The provisions embodied in it," he says, "are no more than tentative proposals and are meant to canvass the views of the representatives of the various interests and political parties, which would be affected by them. So long as the basic principles are accepted, the remaining details can be altered or modified by mutual consultation and discussion among the parties concerned."

"I am certain," say Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan, "that with the announcement of Dominion Status for India, provided it is not unduly delayed, there would be a complete transformation in the attitude of the people towards Great Britain. Thereafter England need have no anxiety in regard to this country and can fully rely on its willing and loyal support in any contingency".

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE TO CONSIST OF VICECHIEF AND COUNCIL OF NOT LESS THAN 7 MINISTERS

The Federal Scheme embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, has evoked adverse criticism from almost all the interests concerned in British India. The qualified blessing given to it by the Hindu Mahasabha—the only organization which has not opposed it—has made matters worse. The leaders of the Mahasabha have openly, repeatedly and ~~unashamedly~~ declared that ~~the scheme~~ is for Hindus alone. These declarations have not ~~unnecessarily~~ failed to accentuate the ~~sympathies~~ and ~~feelings~~ of the ~~others~~. The Indian Princes ~~are not~~ anti-Hindu either, and their ~~alarm~~ born of fear regarding the ~~independence~~ and the ~~future~~ of the States, has gradually but ~~gradually~~ grown to ~~it~~ almost verges on ~~rivalry~~. The ~~representatives~~ of ~~the~~ ~~Indian~~ ~~Princes~~ at the ~~Second Round Table Conference~~ before the ~~details~~ of ~~the~~ ~~scheme~~ had been ~~finalized~~

to an obvious nervousness as a result of the recent unfortunate attempts at direct action against the States by political organizations in British India. This coupled with the experience of the working of Provincial Autonomy and also, perhaps, the implications of the Federal scheme as it has emerged in its final, completed form—seem to have brought home to them the unsuitability and the inherent dangers, from their point of view, of the present scheme.

THE PROBLEM

It is hardly necessary for our present purpose to recapitulate the widely divergent reasons which have actuated the various political parties and interests in British India, as also the Indian States, to enter a caveat against the Federal scheme embodied in the Constitution Act of 1935. The grounds of criticism are well-known and have been repeatedly ventilated by the leading spokesmen of the parties concerned. We need only take cognizance of the fact that the federal proposals embodied in the Government of India Act are unacceptable to a vast majority of the people in this country. At the same time, it is admitted by all concerned, and even those who are opposed to the present scheme, that a Federation of some kind is not only desirable but indispensable for the ordered and peaceful progress of the country as a whole. In a sentence the problem resolves itself into this—"whether it is possible to devise a Federal Scheme to replace the one envisaged by the framers of the Government of India Act, which would satisfy and compose the conflicting interests of the various communities and classes, or at least command a larger measure of support than the present scheme." Any alternative scheme to be generally acceptable must, therefore, be so devised as to allay the reasonable doubts and apprehensions of the minorities and the Indian States, and at the same time meet the criticism levelled on the score of inadequacy of political power which it is proposed to transfer to the representatives of the people under the present scheme.

CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL WORKING

The problem is undoubtedly difficult and complex, but it should not be beyond the ingenuity of British statesmen to plan a revised federal scheme which, if not universally acceptable, would at least command a much larger measure of support and be free from some

of the aims and objects of important political organisations will indicate that there is hardly any divergence of opinion in regard to the ultimate political status which they desire to achieve for India—and this is the shortest possible period. All political parties have set before them the common ideal of attaining complete control over the administration and affairs of their country. It is true that this objective has been described by various political organizations and their leaders in varying phraseology, e.g., "Purna Swaraj", "Complete Independence" "Complete Freedom" and so on. Although these catch-phrases are capable of being construed differently and indeed have been so construed by individual leaders, the basic idea is the same and remains unobscured. It is hardly worth while to attempt a critical elucidation of these catch-phrases with a view to discerning the subtle distinction and reservations, mental or otherwise, which their authors or originators may have in their minds regarding the meaning of these terms. Reservations and qualifications notwithstanding, one incontestable fact clearly emerges from this plethora of catch-phrases and slogans and that is a common desire to secure full control over the affairs and administration of this country. But this does not necessarily connote a severance of connection with Great Britain. Indeed it can be confidently asserted that the intelligentsia in this country, except for some stakeless political adventurers and a few honest ideologists are in favour of retaining that connection.

As I have stated, whatever the differences between the various political parties over other points, they are all agreed on the main objective, *viz.*, complete political freedom for their country. Now let us consider the ways and means available to us for the achievement of that ideal. The history of other countries and nations indicates that the political emancipation of a people—whether from foreign domination or from the despotism of a monarch of their own can be secured only by physical force. In every single instance such a political change was brought about by a revolution entailing violence and bloodshed. The extent of violence and bloodshed varied with the circumstances of each case. Attainment of political power by a subject nation through a process of orderly and peaceful evolution is a consummation unknown to history.

SELF-GOVERNMENT BY STAGES

The undertaking given by the British Government and embodied in the preamble to the Government of India Act, 1919

—to grant self-government to India by progressive stages constitutes the only instance of its kind—a unique experiment which if it is worked by the parties in a spirit of mutual trust and understanding is bound to succeed, and would redound to the everlasting credit of Great Britain. In saying this I am not unmindful of the fact that a section of my countrymen are becoming restive in their impatience to reach in a single spurt the final goal set before us; and there are others who suspect the *bona fides* of the British and are sceptical about the professions of His Majesty's Government to grant political freedom to this country. The former seem to ignore the fact that, if our object is to secure political emancipation for the country as a whole and not for a particular class or community, then we must take with us in our onward march the weak with the strong, and the backward with the more advanced sections of the people. If in our anxiety to force the pace the politically backward sections of the community—and they are by no means inconsiderable—are left behind they would be a source of embarrassment and might even prove a formidable drag which would seriously retard our progress. We must, therefore, so adjust our pace as to keep the main body intact without leaving many stragglers behind. Every possible effort should be made to accelerate the pace of the more tardy amongst us; but it would be a mistake to inflict forced marches on them until they have attained sufficient strength to keep pace with the rest. We have witnessed during the past few months in different parts of the country attempts to stampede the Indian States into accepting political and administrative standards obtaining in British India. And what has been the result? Instead of bringing them closer to and more in line with British Indian provinces these attempts to brow-beat the Rulers have succeeded only in engendering feelings of mistrust and hostility against British Indian Units and in accentuating their doubts and misgivings regarding the Federal scheme. They have now become genuinely apprehensive in regard to their future under any scheme of Federation which does not ensure complete immunity for them from outside interference in their internal affairs. Such set-backs cannot but retard our progress. It is, therefore, imperative that their doubts and apprehensions should be allayed and that the line and pace of advance should be carefully and judiciously planned and settled in collaboration with the various interests concerned.

INTER-COMMUNAL HARMONY

To those who belong to the second category, *i.e.*, the sceptics who doubt the *bona fides* of the British Government, my answer is that we have within the short span of two decades obtained two instalments of political reforms, first in 1920 under the Montagu-Chelmsford Scheme and the second and a more substantial one recently with the introduction of the Government of India Act, 1935. The next and the final instalment cannot be long delayed if we could only remove obstacles which are of our own creation and which can be removed only by ourselves. It would not do, indeed it would be dishonest, to put the blame on the British Government for setting up these obstacles. Let me cite one outstanding instance. Is it not humiliating and painful to witness that since the advent of the New Constitution every single organization, communal or political, is feverishly busy in trying to consolidate its own position *vis-a-vis* the other communities and at their expense, in order to obtain power and supremacy over others? Instead of directing their energies towards the attainment of the solidarity of the country as a whole, the leaders of the various organizations are busy in trying consciously or unconsciously to undermine it. And what is the result? The communal problem, on the solution, of which depends the political salvation of this country still remains unsolved. What is more, it is admitted by all concerned to be the most formidable hurdle in the way of our political advance, and yet we find prominent leaders exhibiting a callous indifference to this vital question. The moral is obvious. Unless we set our house in order by establishing inter-communal harmony and mutual confidence and goodwill between the British Indian Units and the Indian States it is futile to yearn for an immediate attainment of our cherished ideal of an autonomous and united India.

These arguments may be described as hackneyed and specious; but they will bear repetition if only to bring home to the leaders of the different political schools and communities their criminal negligence in trying to brush aside these fundamental and vital problems. Some of them in their feverish anxiety to step immediately into the shoes of their British masters have gone to the length of depicting these problems as of minor concern and even illusory. "Wait till we get Swaraj and all these problems will be solved in no time" is the line of argument adopted by

them. I am afraid these platitudes can no longer avail them. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. We have now had Swaraj in the provincial sphere for a period of more than two years and have tasted some of its fruits. And what do we find? All these problems continue to exist in a more aggravated form; communal bitterness, mutual distrust and riots are rampant and unfortunately there are no perceptible signs of improvement anywhere. If in spite of these clear manifestations they still persist in adhering to their view-point, they will be deserving the fate of the ostrich which buries its head in sand in the face of danger.

"THE BEST METHOD"

Let us next consider how we can best and most expeditiously secure complete control over the affairs and administration of our country. The method of armed revolution, i.e., the use of physical force, is out of the question. We have neither the means nor the capacity to turn the British out of the country by physical force. Any such mad attempt can only result in unnecessary bloodshed followed by retribution of the worst type. The consequences of an unsuccessful rebellion, apart from its other horrors, are a further long and unspecified period of bondage and misery. Those who glibly talk of complete independence in the sense that India should sever its connection with Great Britain either speak with mental reservations or else are incapable of appraising the resources and capacity of their countrymen and the dangers involved in translating their theory into practice. Similarly those who believe that if England is involved in difficulties on account of a world war it would be possible for India to exploit them to her own advantage, are taking a very jaundiced and unintelligent view of the situation. They are making the obvious mistake of overlooking the fact, that if England suffers a reverse in a world war India will be left completely unprotected and will be at the mercy of foreign aggressors both from the east and the west. With its thousands of miles of coastline and extensive land frontiers, in spite of its enormous millions, it would be an easy prey to any well-equipped and determined foe. I leave it to those who advise this suicidal course to consider and decide whether they would prefer the present régime in the prospects of becoming complete masters of th

near future by a process of evolution, or subjection under a new foreign master.

If we eliminate the first alternative, *i.e.*, the attainment of our objective by force, then there remains only the second alternative, namely, the attainment of complete political power and control as an integral part of the British Commonwealth. I am aware that there is also a school of thought led by an eminent and distinguished patriot, which believes and thinks in terms of "internationalism" and considers nationalism with its circumscribed outlook as an impediment in the way of the progress of mankind. Their ideal, I believe, is to establish peace and prosperity the world over by linking the people of all nations into a universal brotherhood by bonds of equality, fraternity and fellowship. I venture to suggest to them that their object can perhaps be best achieved if India remains an equal and free partner within the comity of nations which constitute the British Commonwealth. It does not require much reasoning to show that India with its vast man-power and resources should in time become an influential and even dominant partner in the British Commonwealth and will thus be in a far stronger position to assert its influence in international affairs than it could as a single isolated unit. Moreover, when the trend of events in the international sphere is forcing strong and powerful nations to seek alliances in order to save the peace of the world and the democracies from the aggression of dictators it would be sheer madness on the part of India to cut itself adrift, even if it were in a position to do so, from a friendly and powerful nation like the British who have declared their intention of giving us full political freedom and an equal status with other units in the Commonwealth.

DOMINION STATUS

In view of what I have said above the obvious, and the only practicable course open to India is to accept Dominion Status. It is also time, having regard to the rapidly changing conditions in this country, that Great Britain redeemed its pledge to grant India a status equal to other Dominions. Apart from the question of political expediency, in fairness both to India and Great Britain, it is imperative that a declaration to this effect should not be withheld any longer. Granting of constitutional reforms in dribs and drabs

can no longer satisfy the aspirations of present-day India. This process only whets the appetite of political India and makes it clamour for more. Moreover, it creates an unfortunate impression that these concessions are not conceded willingly, but are wrenched by force of political agitation. It would be far more graceful to make a generous gesture and earn the good-will and gratitude of India by announcing the conferment of full Dominion Status, which has already been accepted as the final goal by Great Britain, than to continue the tantalizing policy of vacillation which makes politically minded India restive and doubtful regarding the *bona fides* of His Majesty's Government and the British nation. I am certain that with the announcement of Dominion Status for India, provided it is not unduly delayed, there would be a complete transformation in the attitude of the people towards Great Britain. Thereafter England need have no anxiety in regard to this country and can fully rely on its willing and loyal support in any contingency. If after this announcement there still remain any recalcitrant ideologists or political adventurers then India would know how to deal with them.

It may be argued that such a course will be attended with many risks. I venture to opine that expediency and statesmanship alike demand that these risks should be faced. Such risks, if any, will be insignificant as compared with the danger of allowing dissatisfaction and unrest to develop into open hostility. Besides, there will be in the revised constitution safeguards similar to those embodied in the constitutions of other Dominions to meet any untoward contingency.

ALTERNATIVE FEDERAL SCHEME

I venture to give below the outlines of an alternative Federal Scheme for consideration. In formulating these proposals I have kept in view the basic principles contained in the first two paragraphs and have tried to avoid as far as possible the defects of the scheme embodied in the Government of India Act which has been adversely criticized for its partial or exclusive bias in favor of the interests concerned. It will be noticed that I have identified myself by giving just a brief outline of the scheme and have refrained from writing full details. This is because at the time of writing the final report on the scheme was not yet ready. The work of writing

2. The representatives in the various Regional Legislatures shall collectively constitute the Central Federal Assembly which will consist of 376 members (250 from British India and 126 from the Indian States).

3. One-third of the total number of representatives in the Federal Assembly shall be Muslims.

4. The other minorities also shall be allotted the share apportioned to them in the Federal Assembly by the Government of India Act, 1935.

5. The Regional Legislature shall deal only with subjects which are included in the Regional List under this scheme, but may at the request of two or more Units included in the zone, legislate with regard to subjects falling in the provincial list in order to secure uniformity and facility of administration within the zone. Such enactments would for application in any Unit within the region require confirmation by the Government of the Unit concerned and shall thereafter supersede any provincial (for State) legislation on the subject.

6. In the Regional Legislature no Bill or other measure having the force of law relating to a subject included in the regional list shall be considered to have been passed unless two-thirds of the representatives vote in favour of the measure. (This limitation is suggested in order to give additional security to the smaller units).

7. The Regional Legislatures may by a resolution authorize the Federal Legislature to undertake legislation with regard to subjects included in the Regional and Provincial lists. But such authorization shall not be effective unless at least 4 out of the 7 zones ask for such action. And unless such authorization is endorsed by all the 7 Regional Legislatures the enactments so passed shall have force only in those zones which ask for such legislation.

8. Any law enacted by the Federal Legislature at the request of the 'Zones' and by the Regional Legislatures at the request of the units shall be repealed if in the case of the Federal Legislature at least 3 'Zones' and in the case of the Regional Legislatures at least half the number of units in that Zone ask for its repeal.

9. The Federal Executive shall consist of His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General as representing His Majesty the King and a Council of Minister, as far as possible, not less than 7 and not more than 11 in number, including the Federal Prime Minister.

10. The Federal Prime Minister shall be appointed by His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General from among the members of the Federal Legislature and the remaining Ministers also among the members of the Legislature in consultation with the Federal Prime Minister, but subject to the following conditions and exception:—

- (i) that each zone shall have at least one representative in the Cabinet,
- (ii) that at least one-third of the Ministers so appointed shall be Muslims;
- (iii) that at least 2, if the number of Ministers does not exceed 9, and at least 3, if the number is in excess of 9, shall be chosen from amongst the representatives of Indian States.

Note 1.—There will be no objection to (ii) and (iii) overlapping i.e., if a Minister representing an Indian State happened to be a Muslim he could also be counted towards the minimum stipulated under (ii) and *vice versa*.

Note 2.—Every attempt will be made to provide adequate representation to other important minorities also.

- (iv) that during the first 20 (or 15) years from the date of the inauguration of the Federal Scheme His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General may nominate 2 of his Ministers either from among the members of the Federal Legislature or from outside and entrust to them the portfolios of "Defence" and "External Affairs". Thereafter all the Ministers shall be selected from among the members of the Legislature.

Note 1.—A tentative allocation of portfolios and designation of Ministers is suggested as under:—

1. Federal Prime Minister.
2. Minister for Defence.
3. Minister for External Affairs.
4. Federal Finance Minister.
5. Minister of Interior (Home).
6. Minister of Communications.
7. Minister to look after minority interests.
8. Minister of Co-ordination (Civil)*
9. Minister of Commerce and Industries.

*He will keep in touch with Regions and arrange co-ordination and uniformity in matters of common concern.

Note 2.—The Minister of External Affairs could also be entrusted with the work connected with the affairs of the Indian States.

11. (a) The normal terms of office of the Ministers shall be the same as the life of the Federal Legislature (*i.e.*, 5 years).

(b) The Minister will retain office at the pleasure of His Majesty's representative *i.e.*, the Viceroy and Governor-General.

(c) A Minister representing a particular zone shall be removed if he loses the confidence of the majority of the representatives of his Regional Legislature.

(d) The Ministry as a whole except the Ministers referred to in paragraph 10 (iv) above shall resign if a vote of no-confidence against the Ministry is carried in the Federal Legislature.

12. The representatives for the Regional Legislatures shall be chosen in the following manner:—

(i) In the case of British Indian Units by the Provincial Legislature in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Government of India Act, 1935 for the election of representatives to the Federal Assembly.

(ii) In the case of Indian States, as nearly as may be possible in accordance with the procedure outlined hereunder:—

(a) during the first 10 years from the date of the inauguration of the Regional and Federal Legislatures three-fourths to be nominated by the Ruler and one-fourth to be selected by the Ruler out of panel to be elected by the State Assembly or other similar institution which shall be set up for this purpose;

(b) during the next 5 years two-thirds to be nominated by the Rulers and one-third to be elected as in (a) above;

(c) after 15 years one-half to be nominated and one-half to be elected, as in (i) above.

(d) after 20 years and thereafter one-third to be nominated and two-thirds to be elected as in (a) above.

(*Note.*—If the number of seats allotted to State or group of States is less than 2, then the Ruler shall nominate for the first 15 years and thereafter the State's representative shall be elected as in

(a) above by the State Assembly or such other institution as may be set up for the purpose.

13. There shall be a Committee of Defence to advise in matters relating to defence. The Committee shall consist of:—

- (i) H. E. the Viceroy and Governor-General—President.
- (ii) The Federal Prime Minister;
- (iii) The Minister for Defence;
- (iv) The Minister for External Affairs;
- (v) The Federal Finance Minister;
- (vi) The Minister for Communications;
- (vii) H. E. the Commander-in-Chief;
- (viii) The Chief of the Central Staff;
- (ix) A Senior Naval Officer;
- (x) A Senior Air Force Officer;
- (xi) Seven Regional representatives, one from each 'Zone' ;
- (xii) 5 Official experts to be nominated by the President;
- (xiii) 2 non-official to be nominated by H. E. the Viceroy ;
- (xiv) The Secretary to the Defence Department.

14. A Committee shall also be constituted to advise on matters connected with External Affairs with

- (i) H. E. the Viceroy as President ; and
- (ii) the Federal Prime Minister ;
- (iii) the Minister for External Affairs ;
- (iv) 7 Regional representatives (one from each 'Zone') to be selected by the President from among the members of the Regional Legislatures.
- (v) 4 other members (2 officials and 2 non-officials) to be nominated by H. E. the Viceroy, and
- (vi) the Secretary for External Affairs, as members.

Note to paras 14-15.

If in any of these Committees the number of representatives from the States falls short of 3, the difference shall be made up by the appointment by the President of additional members selected from a panel proposed by the Chamber of Princes.

15. The Federal Railway Authority shall be so constituted as to include at least one representative from each of the 7 Regional Zones.

16. Effective safeguards shall be provided in the revised constitution—

- (i) for the protection of the legitimate interests of the minorities ;

- (ii) to prevent racial discrimination against British-born subjects;
- (iii) against violation of treaty and other contractual rights of the Indian States;
- (iv) to preserve the integrity and autonomy of both British Indian and Indian States Units against interference by the Federal Executive or Federal or Regional Legislature;
- (v) to ensure the safety of India against foreign aggression, and the peace and tranquillity of the Units as also of the country as a whole;
- (vi) to prevent subversive activities by the citizens of a unit or a zone against another unit or zone;
- (vii) to protect the culture and religious rights of the minorities.

17. The composition of the Indian Army (as on the 1st day of January, 1937) shall not be altered. In the event of a reduction or an increase in the peace-time strength of the Indian Army the proportion of the various communities as on the 1st of January 1937 shall not be disturbed. This condition may be relaxed in the event of a war or other grave emergency which may arise on account of threat to the safety of the country.

(Note.—As regards Indianization of the officers' ranks see my evidence before the Indianization Committee).

18. Only those subjects, the retention of which is essential in the interests of the country as a whole and for its proper administration shall be allocated to the Centre, e.g. Defence, External Affairs, Communications, Customs, Coinage and Currency, etc. The remaining subjects, at present included in the Federal List, shall be transferred to the Units or 'Zones'. Residuary powers in regard to subjects which are not specifically included in the Federal List shall vest in the Units, and, in the case of subjects allocated to 'Zones' in the Regional Legislatures. The concurrent list in the Government of India Act, 1935 shall be revised and limited to legislation only subject to the following conditions:—

- (a) that the federal legislature shall not undertake legislation on any matter within the concurrent list unless at least four zones have applied for it and
- (b) that any legislation so enacted shall apply only to the zones which have applied for it.

19. In the event of a doubt or difference of opinion as to whether a subject is Federal, Concurrent, Regional or Provincial (or State), the decision of H. E. the Viceroy and Governor-General in his discretion shall be final.

20. The Federal Legislature shall be unicameral.

Note.—If it is desired that the special interests' for whom representation in the Central Legislature had been specially provided in the Upper House (Council of State) under the Federal scheme embodied in the Government of India Act should also be given representation in the Unicameral Legislature, then the number of seats in the re-constituted Federal Assembly might be increased to secure them adequate representation. If it is decided to provide additional seats for these 'special interests', then I would suggest that such additional seats should be distributed equally among the 7 'Zones', say, 14 for each Unit or 98 in all. Of these 98 additional seats 60 should be reserved for representatives of British Indian Units and 38 for the Indian States subject to the proviso that the distribution shall be so arranged as not to affect the representation of the Muslims and other minorities in the Assembly as a whole as stipulated in paragraphs (4) and (5) supra.

21. Adequate and effective machinery shall be set up both at the Centre and in the Provinces to look after and protect the interests of the minorities.

(*Note.*—One way of securing this would be to set up statutory committees consisting of representatives of the minorities.)

THE CONFEDERACY SCHEME

The scheme propounded in the *Confederacy of India* by "Punjabi" may be described as follows:—

According to this scheme, the present sub-continent of India can be split up into various countries on the following lines and re-assembled in a confederacy of India: (1) The Indus Regions' Federation, with the Punjab (minus its Eastern Hindu tracts comprising the Ambala division, Kangra district and Una and Garh-shankar tahsils of the Hoshiarpur district,) Sind, the N.W.F.P., Kashmir, Baluchistan, Bhawalpur, Amb, Dir Swat, Chitral, Khanpur, Kalat, Las Bela, Kaparthala, and Malerkotla as its federal

units. The author has calculated that this Federation of the Indus Regions, which he proposes to name as "Indusstan," will comprise an area of 3,98,838 square miles, with a population of about 3,30,000, of whom about 82 per cent. will be Muslims, about 6 per cent. Sikhs and about 8 per cent. Hindus.

(2) The Hindu India Federation with the United Provinces, the Central Provinces, Bihar with some portions of Bengal, Orissa, Assam, Madras, Bombay and the Indian States other than the Rajistan and Deccan States included in the States' Federation as its federal units. The area and population of these units will be as follows:—

Area—7,42,173 square miles.

Population—21,60,41,541.

Percentage of Hindus—83.72.

Percentage of Muslims—11.

(3) The Rajistan Federation with the various States of Rajputana and Central India as its federal units. Their area and population will be as follows:—

Area—1,80,656 square miles.

Population—1,78,58,502.

Percentage of Hindus—86.39.

Percentage of Muslims—8.09.

(4) The Deccan States' Federation comprising the Hyderabad, Mysore and Bastur States. Their area and population is as follows:—

Area—1,25,086 square miles.

Population—2,15,18,171.

Percentage of Hindus—85.28.

Percentage of Muslims—8.99.

(5) The Bengal Federation.—The prominent Muslim tracts of Eastern Bengal and Goalpara and Sylhet districts of Assam, as its provincial units, and Tripura and other States lying within the provincial unit or cut off by its territories from Hindu India as its State units. The area comprised in this Federation, according to the author's calculation, is 59,764 square miles, and the population is about 3,10,00,000, of whom 2,05,00,000 or 66.1 per cent. will be Muslims and 1,01,00,000 or 33.9 per cent. will be Hindus. The author admits that not being familiar with the conditions prevailing in this area his suggestion is subject to adjustments, which

local Muslims may consider necessary. His figures, too, appear to be not quite accurate, although they roughly represent the percentage. The Districts of Bengal which he includes in this Federation are Dinajpur, Malda, Bogra, Rajshahi, Murshidabad, Pabna, Mymensingh, Nadia, JESSORE, Faridpur, Dacca, Tippera, Noakhali, Bakerganj, Khulna and Chittagong.

In a confederation of India on the lines chalked out above, each federation joining it can have a governor-general with the governor of its provincial units under him responsible to the Central Confederation authority, in relation to the confederal subjects, and in matters relating to the rights and obligations of the Crown in respect of the Indian States within the Federation. The confederal authority can be vested in the Viceroy assisted by a confederal assembly consisting of members drawn from the various Indian Federations. The number of such members to be drawn from a federation can be fixed according to its importance judged from the point of view of its significance to the confederacy as regards its geographical situation in the sub-continent, population, area and economic position, etc. Foreign relations, defence, and matters relating to water supply from the common natural sources and rights and obligations of the Crown in relation to the Indian States (which may join any of the British Provinces' Federation) can be entrusted to their Governor-General, who will be responsible to the Viceroy. The various Federations joining the Confederacy can either directly contribute towards the revenue of the Confederacy or assign some portions of their revenues from some specific heads towards its expenses. Under no circumstances should the Muslim North-West consent to assign customs as a source of the confederal revenue." (P. 12.)

The author adds: "This idea of a binational, trilingual and quinquepartite confederation may be novel, and unprecedented in history, but it is not impracticable. A reduced Hindu minority and the Kashmir State with a Muslim population and a Hindu Raja in the federated North-West will form a guarantee for the security of the Muslim minority and Hyderabad State with Hindu population and a Muslim Nizam in Hindu India, and *vice versa*. It does not mean breaking up the geographical unity of the Indian sub-continent by tearing it up into pieces and assigning them to the communities on a population and cultural basis. It simply means internal partition effected between the various members of a joint

family, without breaking their mutual bond of relationship. Consequently, separation means assigning different parts of the sub-continent to different communities on a cultural basis and their reunion in a confederacy." (Pp. 15-16.)

The author does not like exchange of population, and says: "We would prefer separation of the predominantly Muslim regions from Hindu India without any exchange of population. The Indus regions (minus the Ambala division and other Hindu tracts of the Punjab in the North-West), and Chittagong, Dacca and Rajshahi divisions of Bengal with the districts of Goalpara and Sylhet of Assam in the East can be easily separated from India and constituted into two separate States. In this sense, separation will help 2,57,15,657 Muslims of the Indus regions and about 2,30,00,000 of Bengal and Assam to escape Hindu domination, while 2,89,63,343 Muslims will remain in Hindu provinces." (P. 204.)

THE ALIGARH SCHEME

1. That the Muslims of India are a nation by themselves. They have a distinct national unity wholly different from the Hindus and other non-Muslim groups. Indeed they are more different from the Hindus than the Sudeten Germans were from the Czechs ;
2. That the Muslims of India have a separate national future, and their own contributions to make to the betterment of the world ;
3. That the future of the Muslims of India lies in complete freedom from the domination of the Hindus, the British, or for the matter of that, any other people ;
4. That the Muslim majority provinces cannot be permitted to be enslaved into a single All-India Federation, with an overwhelming Hindu Majority at the Centre ; and
5. That the Muslims in the minority provinces shall not be allowed to be deprived of their separate religious, cultural and political identity, and that they shall be given full and effective support by the Muslim majority provinces.

The scheme is to divide India into several wholly independent and sovereign States as follows:—

1. Pakistan comprising the Punjab, N.W.F.P., Sind, Baluchistan and the States of Kashmir and Jammu, Mandi, Chamba, Sakit, Sumin, Kapurthala, Malerkotla, Chitral, Dir, Kalat, Loharu, Bilaspur, Simla Hill States, Bahawalpur, etc.

Population—3,92,74,244.

Muslims—2,36,97,538 ; 60.3 per cent.

2. Bengal (excluding Howrah and Midnapore districts), Purnea district (Bihar), Sylhet division (Assam).

Population—5,25,79,232.

Muslims—3,01,18,184 ; 57.0 per cent.

3. Hindustan comprising the rest of India and Indian States (excluding Hyderabad, Pakistan, Bengal and the States included therein).

Population—21,60,00,000.

Muslims—2,09,60,000 ; 9.7 per cent.

4. Hyderabad comprising Hyderabad, Berar and Karnatak (Madras and Orissa).

Population—2,90,65,098.

Muslims—21,44,010 ; 7.4 per cent.

(a) Delhi Province including Delhi, Meerut division, Rohilkhand division and the district of Aligarh (Agra division).

Population—1,26,60,000.

Muslims—35,20,000 ; 28.0 per cent.

(b) Malabar Province consisting of Malabar and adjoining areas, i.e., Malabar and South Kanara.

Population—49,00,000.

Muslims—14,40,000 ; 27.0 per cent.

Further all the towns of India with a population of 50,000 or more shall have the status of a Borough or Free City with a large measure of autonomy. These will have a Muslim population of 13,88,698. The Muslims in the rural areas of Hindustan must be persuaded not to remain scattered in negligible minorities as they do at present but to aggregate in villages with a preponderant Muslim population.

The aforesaid three States of Pakistan, Bengal and Hindustan should enter into a defensive and offensive alliance on the following basis:—

1. Mutual recognition and reciprocity.
2. That Pakistan and Bengal be recognized as the homeland of Muslims and Hindustan as the homeland of Hindus, to which they can migrate respectively, if and when they want to do.
3. In Hindustan the Muslims are to be recognized as a nation in minority and part of a larger nation inhabiting Pakistan and Bengal.
4. The Muslim minority in Hindustan and the non-Muslim minority in Pakistan and Bengal will have (i) representation according to population and (ii) separate electorates and representation at every stage, together with effective safeguards guaranteed by all the three States. Separate representation according to population may be granted to all considerable minorities in the three States, e.g., Sikhs, non-caste Hindus, etc.
5. An accredited Muslim political organization will be the sole official representative body of the Muslims in Hindustan.

Each of the three independent States of Pakistan, Hindustan and Bengal will have separate treaties of alliance with Great Britain and separate Crown representatives, if any. They will have a joint court of arbitration to settle any dispute that may arise between themselves or between them and the Crown.

APPENDIX B
VIEWS OF MUSLIMS ON PAKISTAN

PAKISTAN—A REMEDY WORSE THAN THE DISEASE

By M. Y. SHAREEF, EDUCATOR & P.

The division of India into Muslim and Hindu states will not pacifying and strengthening India, will create a political condition eternally on the soil, both with regard to the Hindus and the Moslems. How many more necine wars and how long will it take to end the Moslem-Hindu strife? No, in the division of India there is no solution. It is only the country as a whole or the two communities separately which one thinks in terms of separate dominions. The Moslem League's suspicion be accentuated.

The scheme does not offer any guarantee to the safety of the Muslims living in parts other than the ones allotted to them in the east of the country. The Hindus are not fit to rule over the Moslems trouble nearly one-third of the population of the country. In all that is said about the Congress of India, we find that what is true of the Moslems is true, the Congress has been instrumental in creating the oppression. In other words the "two nation" or "two nation nations scheme" would be worse than the present communal system.

As regards the origin of the demand for partition, it is well known that Muslim League conceived the idea of partitioning India during the year after the working of the provincial autonomy in the non-Congress provinces. In his speech delivered at the All-India Muslim Conference held at Lahore on 25th December 1938, he referred to the conditions of the Moslems in the provinces and stated that the Congress had denied the Moslems every possible hope of arriving at a solution of their problems.

Let us now examine the practicalities of the proposed two communal states. It is obviously wrong to suppose that the Moslem or Muslim population of any province can be easily separated from one region to another. If the Moslem population of the north will the north-western and western provinces, the Moslem population of the central and eastern Provinces will be scattered and develop enough political power to defend themselves against the pressure of external aggression. The Moslem population in a competitive world is not master of a single state. The Moslem population of the rights of their community.

If on the other hand, it is contemplated that the minorities will stay where they are, then how are the states to be constituted? There is no province where one community is uniformly in the majority in the whole of its area. There are districts in the Punjab towards the north-west where the Muslims dominate, others in the south-east where the Hindus and Sikhs outnumber the Muslims. Same is the case in Bengal.

The League's resolution, no doubt, provided for adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards in the constitution for minorities, for the protection of their rights and interests. But that will make no change. The minorities' problems will remain exactly as they exist to-day even after the creation of the Muslim and the Hindu states as contemplated under the League scheme.

It is said that after the creation of the Muslim independent states, sanctions would be forced and the minority in the Muslim states would receive safeguards and protection on the principle of reciprocity, that is, the Hindu minorities in the Muslim independent states would receive the same measure of protection as the Muslims would be given in the Hindu independent states. But this would inevitably lead to internecine wars and thus expose India to external invasions.

The Muslims claim India as the land of their birth and they would be the last to wish the subjection of India by any foreign country—be it a Muslim country or a non-Muslim.

From the national point of view every Muslim is an Indian. The common rights of all the inhabitants of the country and their responsibilities in every walk of life and in every sphere of activities are the same. The Indian Muslim, by virtue of these rights and responsibilities, is unquestionably an Indian national and in every part of the country he is entitled to equal privileges with all other Indians in every sphere of governmental, economic and other national activities. For that very reason the Muslims owe equal responsibility with other Indians for striving and making sacrifices to achieve the country's independence.

The past history of political developments in the country have established that it has been possible for interested parties to play the two major communities of India against each other.

It must be admitted that communalism is based on fear and suspicion. Those who have sought to win the leadership of their communities have played upon these two passions.

The fears and suspicions are the result of estrangement which has been brought about between us in the course of the nineteenth century.

On the basis of facts relating to language, literature, science, philosophy, art and religion, it can be stated with every justification that the Muslims and the Hindus of India have evolved a common point of view, a common way of living, a common civilisation, during the long centuries of their contact.

I assert that the unity between the Hindus and the Muslims is not artificial but real, fostered by age-long association and close contact, and that the Hindus and the Muslims can evolve a common nationality and continue to work together, to the common good of all.

PAKISTAN IS NEGATION OF ISLAM

By PROF. ABDUL MAJID KHAN

Muslims throughout the world regard the Holy Quran as the Book of Books. To us it is not only a Code of ethics but a source of Divine wisdom too. Nay, it is the fountain of all light and learning. That the history of Islam has many a glorious page is admitted on all hands and that the present Muslims of India at least have fallen on 'evil days' and evil tongues is also written on the wall ; he who runs can read it. And how do they account for their miserable plight. The reason is obvious. We have clean forgotten the lofty ideals which inspired our forefathers in the past. Instead of spreading the gospel of love and truth, we have unfortunately developed an extremely narrow group loyalty and have, of late, been harping on hymns of hatred.

Islam in its pristine purity and rugged simplicity is the greatest bulwark of world peace, but the underlying idea behind the Pakistan movement is mutual suspicion, estrangement of feelings calculated to foment strife and thus keep Hindus and Muslims eternally at loggerheads. Let us find out what the Quran says about the precious notion of Pakistan ; for the quintesence of our holy scripture is that humanity is fundamentally one and that Islam is pre-eminently a religion of concord and harmony and that Quranic principles are meant for all times and all climes.

(a) The opening verses of the Quran are the pith of Islamic teachings ; these are nothing short of the Lord's prayer for the

Muslims. 'Praise be to God. Lord of the worlds (Universe) ; the Beneficent, the Merciful.'—Surah 1: Verses 1 and 2.

In other words, God is not Lord of the Muslims alone or of the Islamic World, but He is Lord of all the worlds ; He is Father of all mankind.

(b) Say (unto the people): Dispute ye with us concerning God, when He is our Lord and your Lord (too). We are responsible for our doings and ye for yours. And We are sincere to Him."—Surah 2, Verse 139. A Muslim's conception of God is not at all narrow or 'cabined, cribbed and confined'... It includes all that is best in all other religions.

(c) "Mankind were one nation, and God sent (unto them) Prophets as bearers of good tidings and as Warners, and revealed therewith the scripture with the truth that it might judge between mankind, concerning that wherein they differed. And only those unto whom (the scripture) was given differed concerning it, after clear proofs had come unto them, through hatred of one another. And God by His will guided those who believe unto the truth of that concerning which they differed. God guideth whom He will upto a straight path."—Surah 2, Verse 213.

The genesis of Pakistan is due to the erroneous idea that the Hindus are inferior to the Muslims from the social, religious and cultural view points hence, they must be treated as political untouchables. The above verses speak of the Universal law according to which prophets were raised among all nations, because all humanity constitutes but one nation in the eyes of God and the same Divine law ought to apply to them all.

(d) "O Mankind! Be careful of your duty to your Lord who created you from a single soul and from it created its mate and from them twain hath spread abroad a multitude of men and women."—Surah 4. Verse 1.

Here again, the Quran talks in terms of mankind and not of Muslims and non-Muslims. What is rightly stressed, is that humanity at its fountain-head is one and indivisible and that differences in external things are altogether superficial and are results of the labours of the barber and the tailor. 'Colonel's Lady and Judo Grady are sisters under the skin,' said Kipling. To divide mankind socially, culturally or religiously into water-tight compartments, is positively un-Quranic.

(e) "But whosoever surrendereth his purpose to God, while doing good, his purpose to good, his reward is with his Lord ; and

"there shall no fear come upon them, neither shall they grieve." Surah 2, Verse 112.

Mark the word "whosoever" which applies to Jews as well as Christians; to Hindus as well as to Muslims alike. The Quran is undoubtedly democratic in its appeal or exhortation; while Pakistan cuts across all the canons of democracy. It discounts the belief that those who profess certain creeds will be saved or they alone will attain salvation. On the other hand, it is complete submission to God and the doing of good to His creatures, which is the only criterion of real virtue and the true source of salvation.

(f) "O Ye who believe! Be steadfast witness for God in equity, and let not hatred of any people seduce you that ye deal not justly. Deal justly that is nearer to your duty. Observe your duty to God. Lo' God is informed of all that we do."—Surah 5, Verse 8.

It is all well to do justice and act righteously in a favourable or neutral atmosphere, but real test comes when you have to do justice to people who hate you or to whom you have an aversion. But higher moral law must be invariably observed. The accuser can never play the role of a judge. To insist on Pakistan, is to ensure the triumph of the role of Unlaw or downright injustice, hence it is quite un-Quranic.

(g) "And of His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the difference of your language and colours. Lo': here, indeed, are portents for men of knowledge."—Surah 3, Verse 22.

In the above lines the Quran emphasizes the essential unity that underlies unity bewitching and bewildering diversity in this world. Eyes may be numerous, but focus should be one. Hindus and Muslims as citizens of India are one and the same; are sons of the same soil, and almost all their interests are identical. Therefore, why dream of Pakistan and foster fissiparous tendencies and encourage communal frenzy? In the words of the world-renowned mystic, Maulana Rumi: "You came to unite (by love) and not divide (through hatred)."

(h) "O Mankind! Lo we have created you male and female, and have made you nations and tribes that ye may know one another. The noblest of you in the sight of God is the best in conduct. Lo! God is Kower and Aware." Surah 49, Verse 13.

The above words are addressed to all mankind and not only to Muslims. As it is, humanity is descended from one pair of parents. Tribes, races and nations are only convenient tables by

which we may know, understand and appreciate various characteristics. Before the white throne of God, they are all one, and he gets greatest honour who is most righteous. In other words *Amal* and *Ikhlaq* ("gun Karam and subhas") alone matter.

(i) "So he who has done an atom's weight of good shall see it. And he who has done an atom's weight of evil shall see it." Surah 99, Verses 7 and 8.

To use Biblical languages, "By their actions, ye shall judge them." Such is the clear law of good and evil. Not an atom's weight of good or evil, whoever may be the doer of it, is left without its reward. That is to say, every action has a consequence and this is something relentless and equally covers Muslims and non-Muslims.

(j) "Ah, what will convey unto thee what the Ascent (up-hill work) is? It is to free a slave". Surah 90, Verses 12 and 13.

The difficult path of virtue is defined here as freeing the bondman. Islam accordingly stands for banishing political, economic and social slavery, and a *true Muslim* is so passionately liberty-loving that he can never be a slave; while Pakistani friends are postponing India's emancipation to Doom's Day and are out to give an indefinite lease of life to British Imperialism.

To make a long story short, according to the Quaranic principles, no prophet had a special audience with God and that no particular creed has a complete monopoly of truth. Dogmas and rituals are just the shell of religion while righteousness and service of humanity form its substance and that Islam is essentially a unifying force and definitely abhors divisions on creedal basis and is totally opposed to the vivisection of India. Let us all respond to the clarion call of the Holy Quran, bury the demon of Pakistan.

NO BELIEF IN TWO-NATION THEORY

By SIR WAZIR HASAN, KT.

There should be no division of India into several geographical zones or spheres of influence as they are all sons of the same motherland. I do not believe in two-nation theory either. The great Indian heritage is the common possession of all. The observance of different faiths should not stand in the way of achieving the desired unity.

NO PARTITION OF INDIA

MALIK BARKAT ALI, M.L.A. (PUNJAB)

Malik Barkat Ali as Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Punjab Nationalist Muslims Conference held in 1931 said: "However much the conception of a Hindu India and Muslim India may appeal to and send into frenzied ecstasies abnormally orthodox mentalities of their party, we offer our full-throated opposition to it not only because it is singularly unpractical and really obnoxious; but because it not only sounds the death-knell of all that is noble and lasting in modern political activity in India, but is also contrary to and opposed to India's chief historical tradition.

The conception of a divided India, which Sir M. Iqbal put forward recently in the course of his presidential address from the platform of the League at a time when that body had virtually become extinct and ceased to represent free Islam must not delude anybody to thinking that that is Islam's conception of the India of the future. Even if Sir Md. Iqbal had not recanted it as something which could not be put forward by any sane person, I should have emphatically and unhesitatingly repudiated it as something alien to the genius and the spirit of the rising generation of Islam, and I deem it my proud duty to affirm that not only must there be no division of India into communal provinces, but that both Islam and Hinduism must run conterminously with the boundaries of India."

—Tribune—Lahore—9-7-1941.

which we may know, understand and appreciate various characteristics. Before the white throne of God, they are all one, and he gets greatest honour who is most righteous. In other words *Amal* and *Ikhlaq* ("gun Karam and subhas") alone matter.

(i) "So he who has done an atom's weight of good shall see it. And he who has done an atom's weight of evil shall see it." Surah 99, Verses 7 and 8.

To use Biblical languages, "By their actions, ye shall judge them." Such is the clear law of good and evil. Not an atom's weight of good or evil, whoever may be the doer of it, is left without its reward. That is to say, every action has a consequence and this is something relentless and equally covers Muslims and non-Muslims.

(j) "Ah, what will convey unto thee what the Ascent (up-hill work) is? It is to free a slave". Surah 90, Verses 12 and 13.

The difficult path of virtue is defined here as freeing the bondman. Islam accordingly stands for banishing political, economic and social slavery, and a true Muslim is so passionately liberty-loving that he can never be a slave; while Pakistani friends are postponing India's emancipation to Doom's Day and are out to give an indefinite lease of life to British Imperialism.

To make a long story short, according to the Quaranic principles, no prophet had a special audience with God and that no particular creed has a complete monopoly of truth. Dogmas and rituals are just the shell of religion while righteousness and service of humanity form its substance and that Islam is essentially a unifying force and definitely abhors divisions on creedal basis and is totally opposed to the vivisection of India. Let us all respond to the clarion call of the Holy Quran, bury the demon of Pakistan.

NO BELIEF IN TWO-NATION THEORY

By SIR WAZIR HASAN, Kt.

There should be no division of India into several geographical zones or spheres of influence as they are all sons of the same motherland. I do not believe in two-nation theory either. The great Indian heritage is the common possession of all. The observance of different faiths should not stand in the way of achieving the desired unity.

Mussalmans are in a minority, adequate effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political administrative and other rights and interests in constitution with them.

This Session further authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary."

(Resolution adopted by the All India Azad Muslim Conference held at Delhi on 30th April, 1940 against the Pakistan Scheme.)

"This Conference of representatives of the Indian Muslims, who desire to secure the fullest freedom for their country, consisting of delegates and representatives from all provinces, after having given its fullest and most careful consideration to all the vital questions affecting the interests of the Muslim community, and the country as a whole, declares the following:—

India, with its geographical and political boundaries is an indivisible whole, and as such, it is the common homeland of all the citizens, irrespective of race or religion, who are joint owners of its resources.

All nooks and corners of the country contain the hearths and homes of the Muslims, and the cherished historic monuments of their religion and culture, which are dearer to them than their lives.

From the national point of view every Muslim is an Indian. The common rights of all the inhabitants of the country and their responsibilities in every walk of life and in every sphere of activity are the same.

The Indian Muslim, by virtue of these rights and responsibilities, is unquestionably an Indian national, and in every part of the country, he is entitled to equal privileges with all other Indian nationals in every sphere of governmental, economic and other national activities. For that very reason, Muslims owe equal responsibility with other Indians for striving and making sacrifices to achieve the country's Independence.

This is a self-evident proposition, the truth of which no right-thinking Muslim will question.

This Conference declares unequivocally and with all the emphasis at its command that the goal of Indian Muslims is complete independence along with the protection of their religious and communal rights, and they are anxious to attain this goal as early as possible.

Inspired by this aim, they have in the past made great sacrifices.

This Conference unreservedly and strongly repudiates the baseless charge levelled against Indian Muslims by the agents of British Imperialism and others that they are an obstacle in the path of Indian freedom and emphatically declares that the Muslims are fully alive to their responsibility and consider it inconsistent with their tradition and derogatory to their honour to lag behind others in the struggle for the country's independence."

APPENDIX D

THE OLD GAME

By PYARELAL

The Britisher today waxes indignant at being reminded that the communal problem in India, as we see it today, is largely the creation of the British themselves and a part and parcel of the imperialist game of 'divide and rule'. But he can do so, as the following narrative will show, in the teeth of recorded history.

A friend has sent a penetrating monograph, based on a study of diaries of Lady Minto, that throws a flood of light on this phase of British Indian policy. In the winter of 1905-06, George V, as Prince of Wales, made a tour of India and returned to England in the spring of 1906. In a letter to Lord Minto, the then Viceroy, dated 11th May 1906, Lord Morley wrote:

"Yesterday I had a long conversation with the Prince of Wales in which he gave me an immensely interesting account of his impressions in India. His key word is that we should get on better if our administrators showed wider sympathy... He talked of the National Congress rapidly becoming a great power. My own impression, formed long ago, and confirmed since I came to this office, is that it will mainly depend upon ourselves whether the Congress is a power for good or evil. There it is, whether we like it or not."¹

To this letter Lord Minto replied on May 28th, 1906:

"As to Congress.....there is much that is absolutely disloyal in the movement and that there is danger for the future, I have no doubt. You see extracts from the Vernacular press; the great bulk of the tone of it can only be termed disloyal..... I have been thinking a good deal lately of a possible *counterpoise to Congress aims*. I think we may find a solution in the Council of Princes or in an elaboration of that idea, a Privy Council not only of Native Rulers, but of a few other big men to meet, say once a year, for a week or a fortnight, at Delhi for instance. Subjects for discussion and procedure would have to be very carefully thought

1. Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. II, p. 170-71.

us mind, what I had stated, that, like all other English radicals, I had hatred of Islam. What other Liberals thought of Islam, I did not know, but for myself, if I were to have a label, I should be called a Positivist, and in the Positivist Calendar, framed by Comte after the manner of Catholics, Mahomet is one of the great leading saints, and has the high honour of giving his name to a Week! This will soon be expanded into a paragraph in *The Daily Mail*, that, the Indian S. S. has turned Mahomedan. That, at any rate, *would tend to soften Mahomedan alienation from our plans*. Forgive all this nonsense. Like many another man of grave (or dull) temperament, I seek snatches of relief from boredom by clapping on a fool's cap at odd moments." (Italics mine).

Later on, however, as the fruits of his policy began to give him a foretaste of what was coming, Lord Morley seems to have felt uneasy misgivings within him that he had perhaps gone too far in the Mohammedan direction, and that it was necessary to cry a halt. It appears that the India Council, especially Sir Theodore Morrison, was anxious to favour the Muslim claims. On August 6, 1909, Lord Morley wrote to Lord Minto as follows:

"Morrison is pertinacious up to the eleventh hour about his M. friends; insists on our pledges, and predicts a storm of M's reproach and dissatisfaction. It may be so. On the other hand, G. predicts that departure from the line we have agreed upon in our dispatch, would provoke at least as much reproach and dissatisfaction among the Hindus. We shall therefore have a stubborn talk

Council, to which I shall not contribute more than two or three stubborn sentences. I am the least in the world of a Cromwellian, but I am beginning to understand, in a way never understood before, how impatience at the delays and cavilling and mistaking of very small points for big ones at last drove Oliver to send his Councillors packing."

In his letter of August 26 to Lord Minto, the reaction has become even more marked. He is already talking about his determination to 'put his foot definitely down':

"Morrison tells me that a Mahometan is coming over here on purpose to see me, and will appear on Monday next. Whatever happens, *I am quite sure that it was high time to put foot definitely down and to let them know that the process of haggling has gone on long enough, come what may. I am only sorry we could not do it earlier.*"^s (Italics mine).

The last entry relating to this dismal episode is dated December 6, 1909. The wheel has come full circle. Writes the philosopher Secretary of State to Lord Minto, with ill-concealed chagrin, "I won't follow you again into our Mahometan dispute. Only I respectfully remind you once more that it was your early speech about their extra claims that first started the M. hare. I am convinced my decision was best." But it was too late to retract. The mischief was done. The "counterpoise to Congress aims", that Lord Minto had envisaged, was created in the form of communal representation. Sixtytwo millions of people were "pulled back" from "joining the seditious ranks". But the most surprising part of the story is that Nationalist India is today called upon, by the successors of the statesman who deliberately started the "hare" of communalism, to expiate for their predecessors' sins!

The other expedient, not less Machiavellian, suggested by Lord Minto in pursuance of his policy of divide and rule was not left untried. We see it in full swing today even like the communal device. But the story of the exploitation of the princely order for strengthening and perpetuating the imperialist structure I must reserve for full narration on another occasion.

Ramgarh, 16-3-40.

—*Harijan*—30-3-1940.

OPINIONS OF EMINENT PERSONS ON MR. REZAUL KARIM'S WORKS

SIR P. C. RAY, K.T.:

"... It is a hopeful sign that New Bengal has a worthy son in the person of Mr. Rezaul Karim. He is thoroughly against communalism. In this he is in the forefront of our political writers, and I think he is unique. . . ."

DR. SUNITI KUMAR CHATTERJEE, M.A., P.R.S., D.LIT.:

"... With his facile and convincing pen in both English and Bengali Mr. Rezaul Karim has been an indefatigable soldier in the fight for the cause of sweet reasonableness in the domains of life, literature in Bengal. . . . I hope that Mr. Karim's books will have a place in all libraries in India, and I cannot think that any library in India can afford to be without these works by Mr. Karim which discuss in such dispassionate yet forceful manner what is the most vital problem of Indian life."

(—*Modern Review*, July, 1939.)

বরিশাল উন্নানিয়ার জমিদার মৌলবী হাজী ওয়াহেদ রেজা চৌধুরী সাহেবে রোগপথ
হইতে লিখিয়াছেন :—“এ কথা সকলেরই মনে রাখা উচিত, “মোহসুদীর” বন্ড বনী
সাংগ্রামিক বিষয়ে সাহিত্য সভার কালের কবলে পঞ্চিয়া যাইবে। পক্ষান্তরে একজন
রেজাটিল করিমের লেখা জাতির মন প্রস্তুত করিয়া তাহার চিত্তে অক্ষয় সম্পর্কে
বর্তমান ধার্কিবে।”

—আনন্দবাজার পত্রিকা—৩০/৬/১৯৩৯।

